Published on the 15th of the month

Vol. XXIX. No. 1 APRIL, 1939

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
The Religious Influence of the Wireless	1
Tables of Affinity brought Up to Date	3
The Genius of English Religion	5
A Modern Saint	8
The Friends of Reunion and their Cross	10
Traditionalists versus Modernists	12
The Idea of a National Church Professor Creed, D.D.	15
The Christian Platonists of Cambridge A. W. Adams, M.A.	23
The Fourth Gospel in Interpretation and Research: Some Recent Books C. J. Wright, B.D.	27
Evangelism and the Film T. H. W. Maxfield, M.A.	33
Book Reviews:	
The Cheerful Doctor	36
The Implications of the Reformation	39
A Modern Thomist Moralist	41
While I was Musing	43
The Crisis and its Cure	45
Criminals in the Making	46
Two Modern English Preachers	47
Worship in Church	50
Short Notices	51
Correspondence	53

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1s. net. Annual Subscription, 10/6

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

Founder : Bishop BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., K.C.V.O.
Warden: The Right Rev. Bishop STRONG, G.B.E., D.D., Hon. D.Mus.
Principal : Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
Vice-Principal : Rev. L. B. CROSS, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College.
Senior Tutor : Rev. W. J. CRATCHLEY. M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D.
Chaplain: Rev. A. W. ADAMS, M.A.
Lecturer : Rev. JOHN TODD, M.A.

RIPON HALL is a Graduate Theological College designed to afford a training on modern lines to candidates for Holy Orders in any diocese of the Anglican Communion.

Graduates of approved Universities, residing for two years at Ripon Hall, can qualify for the B.A. degree of the University of Oxford with Honours in Theology.

Full particulars of the Course, Fees, Exhibitions, etc., can be had on application to the Principal, Ripon Hall, Boars Hill, Oxford.

Laymen who desire a broad-minded, sympathetic, and well-educated Clergy can materially assist this end by contributing to the Exhibition Fund of Ripon Hall, and to its endowment.

SPRINGHERNE

GUEST HOUSE

ROSS - ON - WYE

The house is set above an orchard and meadows, on a hill looking West over the Wye Valley towards the Welsh Hills, within easy reach of Symond's Yat, Tintern and Llantony Abbeys, four famous castles.

The neighbourhood offers fishing, rough shooting, riding, golf, bathing, tennis and delightful walking.

TERMS

Three Guineas a Week. No Extras.
Special terms for Reading Parties.

SPRINGHERNE, Bull's Hill, WALFORD, ROSS-ON-WYE.
Tel. 293

THE Busy Man's Reliable Literary Assistant. Researches made and data supplied by experienced author. Confidence guaranteed. D. W. 1, Waverley Mansions, Kenton Street, W.C.1

READERS of the *Modern Churchman* are asked to support our advertisers, and to mention the *Modern Churchman* when replying to advertisements in our pages.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1. APRIL, 1939. Vol. XXIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Religious Influence of the Wireless.

The League of Prayer and Service founded on Armistice Day, 1938, by the Revs. W. H. Elliott, Pat McCormick, M. E. Aubrey and S. M. Berry, which now has reached a membership of over two millions, testifies to the influence of the wireless in the religious sphere in this country. At a week-day service held on March 15 at Birmingham Town Hall, at which addresses were given by three out of the four leaders, long queues assembled some hours before the meeting and the crowd was so large that many failed to obtain admission. The League was initiated through the wireless, and the wireless has been its chief means of propagation. This is an extraordinary achievement, but the vast membership of the League testifies, not only to the influence of the wireless in religion among ourselves, but also to some other significant religious facts.

It points to the deep-seated religious feeling which exists in England and the strong desire to satisfy its claims. Another evident fact to which it points is that for many the religion which meets their religious needs must be of a very simple kind. Hardly anything could be less simple religiously than the de-

mands made by membership of the League of Prayer and Service. The primary purpose of the prayer which each member of the League practises is the securing of peace: peace in every sphere — international, social, domestic, personal.

Associated with prayer is the obligation of unselfish service. In this sphere advice may be sought from the leaders of the League. Much of the service suggested is social service. This takes the form, in some cases, of work in social service centres: the 'adoption' of families in the distressed areas: the assisting of persecuted and exiled refugees whom troubles abroad have driven into this land.

The method of entering the League is also very simple. Mr. Elliott writes of it:

> 'Day by day round the Unknown Warrior's Grave in the Abbey people enrol themselves by signing a book and taking a prayer card.'

But a visit to the Unknown Warrior's Grave is not needful for membership. It suffices if a card of membership be signed and sent in to Mr. Elliott: no subscription is demanded, no promises are required: merely the expression of a desire to become a member of the Fellowship.

The simple, practical and private character of this religious movement is, we believe, responsible in no small measure for its rapid advance. Some may scoff at it as 'religion without tears,' and add that what costs little will be proved to be worth little. We deprecate such hostile criticism. This religion, although no subscription is demanded and no collections are made, yet does require service, and even sacrifice, from its adherents, and such is forthcoming in a number of cases. In some respects it seems to us to resemble the Boy Scout movement, which has achieved and is achieving so much good.

It seems to us that a movement in which the service is social and the practice of religion is private comes very near the religion of Jesus as we have it in our earliest Gospel records: 'When thou prayest enter into thy chamber and shut the door.' It also seems to us that although the wireless may prove detrimental to attendance at the public services of the Church, it will more than compensate by what it is doing to promote personal religion.

Tables of Affinity brought Up to Date.

We are glad to observe that the Bishop of Birmingham has issued a pronouncement to his clergy on the document popularly known as 'A Man may not marry his Grandmother,' but officially entitled 'A table of kindred and affinity wherein whosoever are related are forbidden in Scripture and our laws to marry together.' The Bishop's pronouncement was published in the *Times* of March 20 :

> In June, 1931, Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York were appointed to report on questions relating to the Church and marriage. Their report was presented in June, 1935, and contained a unanimous recommendation that the Table of Kindred and Affinity should be revised : 'The Table of Affinity presupposes that a principle lies behind the prohibitions in *Leviticus* which is not to be found there.'
>
> No steps have so far been taken to effect such revision, and heretofore I have advised clergy in my diocese that, as the table expresses the law of the Church, the clergy should not solemnize marriages which, though legal, are contrary to that law.
>
> The Chancellor of the Diocese, however (the Worshipful W. Cleveland-Stevens, K.C.), advises that the law of the land in this matter is the law of the Church. I propose, then, to alter my advice and to tell the clergy, who for the most part no longer have any reluctance so to act, that they may solemnize any marriages made legal by the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act, 1907, and the extending Acts of 1921 and 1931.
>
> My Chancellor's argument is as follows :
>
> 'The Table of Kindred and Affinity is of course no part of the Book of Common Prayer—*i.e.* of the book annexed to the Act of Uniformity of 14, Charles II. I have so far failed to discover when it first found its way into our Prayer-books, and the question, when raised some years ago in *Notes and Queries,* was apparently never answered ; but one knows that Archbishop Parker in 1563, acting under Royal Authority, "set forth" the Table, and that it obtained full synodal authority, apart from the Canons of 1571, from Canon 99 of 1603, which ordered it to be publicly set up in churches.
>
> 'In this connexion the law of the Church (in so far as it may be distinguished from the law of the land) was Canon 99 ; but the Canons derive their force from the Act of Submission of 25, Henry VIII, and if there is anything in the Canons inconsistent with the Statute law the Canons are to that extent invalid and of no force or effect.
>
> 'When the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act, 1907, became law it operated to repeal every prior statute or Canon that would militate against the complete validity of these marriages or would treat them as forbidden or "contrary to God's law," and the same reasoning applies to the Acts of 1921 and 1931 which complete the trilogy of the Marriage (Prohibited Degrees of Relationship) Acts, 1907 to 1931.

'What I have said above is taken largely from judgments in the Court of Appeal and the House of Lords in the Banister case, which is reported in the Law Reports, Probate, 1910, and House of Lords, 1912. I need not remind you that the contention persistently urged in that case that the Act of 1907 gives validity to such a marriage merely "as a civil contract" (whatever that may mean) failed signally: and there is the highest authority for saying that a marriage validated by this Act is as valid as any other marriage within the realm, and is now legal and valid for all purposes, and the same must necessarily be said of marriages within either of the two later Acts.

'If I am right so far, it follows that *qua* the marriages validated by the Acts of 1907, 1921, and 1931 the Table has ceased to form part of the law of the Church, and that the issuing of licences for such marriages is compatible with the maintenance of that law.'

In recent years it has been most unpleasant to me from time to time to say to a vicar that he ought not to perform the ceremony when some honourable man desired to marry his deceased wife's sister. I am glad that henceforth I have my Chancellor's authority for advising that such and similar marriages may rightly take place in church.

The *Church Times*, in its editorial comment of March 24, is deeply incensed at the pronouncements of the Bishop of Birmingham and his Chancellor. The fact that a clergyman who marries his deceased wife's sister is liable to ecclesiastical censure has been used by the *Church Times* as a justification for the following diatribes:

'But a marriage which brings on a clergyman ecclesiastical censure is hardly one which he ought to deem suitable for members of his flock, since it cannot in Anglican teaching serve to godliness. We cannot, therefore, regard the Chancellor's view of the law as satisfactory, and we trust that loyalty to the Church of England will lead the Birmingham clergy to repudiate their Bishop's suggestion. Even on the statute law the Bishop's case is not a good one, but, apart from this, it is disloyal to Christianity for clergymen to treat the decisions of secular Courts on these matters as serious authorities. The Church is a society, and its marriage law is to be found in the teachings of our Lord and of St. Paul, and in the traditions of the Church, not in the decisions of Mr. Cleveland-Stevens, or even of Lord Halsbury. St. John the Baptist is a better authority than either.'

It is difficult to decide whether the argument of the *Church Times* is more ludicrous than unscrupulous, or more unscrupulous than ludicrous. The New Testament contains no prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. Our Lord passed no condemnation on the woman who was married successively to seven brothers nor on the brethren themselves. St. Paul said much about marriage, but uttered no prohibition with regard to marriage with a deceased wife's sister. John the Bap-

tist lost his head, not for condemning marriage with a deceased wife's sister, but for condemning adultery with the wife of a living brother.

For years past we have advised enquirers that they were justified in refusing to post in their churches the 'Table of Affinity' as it appears in our Prayer Book, since not having been revised and brought up to date the Table must, if consulted by anyone, deceive the reader as to the true legal position. In answer to the Archidiaconal Visitation question, Is the Table of Prohibited Degrees 'publicly set up' in your church, and where? we have advised churchwardens to reply, 'No; unable to secure an officially correct Table.'

It is cheering to feel that after so many years we are in this matter to be enabled by our Church authorities to do the right thing in the right way. In this connection we would venture a further piece of advice. Notwithstanding the official alteration in the Table of Prohibited Degrees there are cases, owing to the force of ecclesiastical tradition, where one or other of the parties coming to be married within the old prohibited degrees may not be entirely easy in their conscience; or where others who are present at the ceremony may feel scruples. In such a case it is advisable for the officiating clergyman to indicate clearly in his marriage address that such a marriage is justified at the bar of Scripture, morality and physiology.

The Genius of English Religion.

Religion in England is variously classified: Church and Chapel, or their more clumsy and less accurate synonyms, Anglican and Free Church. The latter comprises Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Quakers and many other bodies of English Nonconformists. The Church consists of Catholics and Evangelicals, Fundamentalists and Modernists, the London and Brighton South Coast Religion and the Mothers' Union. All of these have their peculiarities but differ from each other far less than they suppose, and they are all characteristically English. Of course there are other Christian bodies in England —for instance, the Roman Catholics and the Presbyterians— but these are not characteristically English.

The great majority of these English Christians do not attend Divine Worship save at baptisms, marriages and burials. Yet these people are undoubtedly Christian in their sympathies although there is a tendency in ecclesiastical circles to classify them as pagan. Their religion, although Christian, is also essentially English, and as the British Empire as well as individuals owe much to it, it deserves attention.

Mr. Basil de Selincourt, in a review in the *Observer* of Sunday, March 5, describes this English religion with insight and arresting felicity of phrase. He recognizes, as do most of us—it may be a mark of our insularity—the recrudescence of barbarism on the Continent. This recrudescence is closely connected, so we believe, with anti-democratic policies and is linked with anti-Christian feeling. We English have so far escaped it because of our generally enlightened and practical Christian outlook. The conception of the Christian religion among English people, as a whole, is neither obscurantist nor unpractical. Enlightened Christian thought is widely respected in this country and the Christian character is always admired. Obscurantist, sectarian and artificial presentations of the Christian religion have very largely failed to secure the loyalty of the English people at large, but not large-minded, large-hearted, practical Christianity.

On the Continent it is otherwise, as Mr. de Selincourt points out:

> 'How very hardly religion has fared of late in countries where it had retained its old intransigence! From a worldly point of view it might be said to have utterly failed. Blind reactionary forces have risen against it and swept it away. But then one can mean very different things when using the same word. What has been swept away was perhaps mainly the old *religio*, the binding thing, which, to my mind, scarcely merits the name of religion any more; whereas the unanimity of freedom we enjoy in this country seems to me . . . eminently religious. To my apprehension it proceeds from love of God, and with that love there is mixed more and more, it seems to me, a recognition of mystery, a faith in the unknown. "O that I knew where I might find Him." We are beginning to think of religion as a realm of discovery, to realise that the zest of life is the quest of the Divine and that we are committed to an inexhaustible adventure.'

Closely connected with this thought of the 'Quest of the Divine' as the need of every human soul goes the conviction that each individual must do it for himself and that no body of

men, however competent and however authoritative, have any right to do it for him or to control him in his way of doing it. These competent and authoritative persons may persuade, they may advise, they may set an example; but what they must not do, if they would succeed with the English people, is to command. Mr. de Selincourt writes:

> 'And there, it seems to me, there precisely, the religious genius of the English people has declared itself: in that it felt so early the crack in the totalitarian idea, and preferred to tolerate innumerable sects of seekers and finders, each taking their own little way, each learning something of truth by the vitality and intensity of their blunderings. . . . Our fundamental instinct surely has been that in religion, as in all else and more than in all else possibly, the first principle to be acknowledged is that no man can be another's master. In religion, we have realized, authority is nothing, example everything.'

Mr. de Selincourt recognizes the attractiveness of the religion of authority, the joy of self-surrender to those who will command us what to believe and what to do, but true to essential Christianity—the Religion of the Spirit—he recognizes the defects and limitations of all religions of authority:

> 'But a deep instinct warns us that the kind of truth we seek in religion requires of us supremely to quicken vision here and now, to apply the enlightening Spirit immediately to this growing world in which every one of us plays his creative part. The old, easy conception of the closed book with its accredited expositors, the one book in which life's truth was long since written and its duties laid down, goes by the board; we see that the kind of truth that can be told by one man to another, or embalmed, or reserved, is not religious truth. Religious truth rather, is the enclosing, living truth of which all events, all time and space, are the continuing revelation; it is the spirit, the power, the emotion, in whose virtue they are what they are. In us it is life, and the meaning of our life is to penetrate and disclose its meaning, surrendered to it in complete dependency, in a surrender which indeed is love; the desire to be worthy, the desire to realize our union and grow to the stature for which we have been nurtured, infinite and eternal, in the womb of Time.'

In the face of our rapidly increasing modern knowledge and the increasing manifoldness of modern experience, to follow the guidance of this ever-present, ever-advancing Spirit of Truth is an intensely difficult matter.

> 'As knowledge grows in complexity the religious attitude is more difficult to find and to take; how hardly shall he that hath riches enter into the Kingdom of Heaven! But of one thing we may be sure: that no knowledge can ever menace or conflict with the knowledge that encloses all. It is our misfortune to-day that the religious life is still so widely identified institutionally with extinct knowledge, with ideas ex-

pressed in terms that we can only accept because we have grown up among them. We await the emancipation of a contemporary faith.'

We are in hearty agreement with all this provided it be recognized that religion must have its institutional side, its literature, and its leaders: because if we are to have religious progress it is needful to have religious continuity: and religious institutions are necessary for religious continuity. What we need, however, is that our religious institutions should be our servants, not our masters, or rather the servants of that spirit of freedom, truth and love which is the Spirit of Christ.

A Modern Saint.

Each of the higher religions has its saints. They present its ideal realized in action. The saints of the Christian religion vary more in character than those of any other religion, and that because Christianity is more multiform than any other religion. The difference between Christian saints is so great that some who admire one species refuse to regard those of another species as saints at all. We have heard a good Catholic say, 'One of the weaknesses of Protestantism is that it produces no saints.'

Those who love the Quaker saint will not be attracted by the Papal saint. To be a Papal saint it is necessary to work miracles: it is necessary to be orthodox in accordance with the Tridentine model: it is also necessary to be loyal to the Papal system even to the extent of being martyred for it. Quaker saints possess none of these qualifications.

The *Times* of March 7 contained an obituary of Dr. Dudley Buxton, Bursar of Exeter College, Oxford. One of the questions which vexed the mediaeval Churchman's soul was whether an Archdeacon can be saved. The modern undergraduate has, on occasions, similar doubts with regard to College Bursars. Yet a reader of Dr. Buxton's obituary might be led to feel that this bursar came not only in the class of the saved, but even of the saintly. His saintliness was of a peculiarly modern kind. It ignored ecclesiastical distinctions. On Sundays he would attend Mass in the morning with his Roman Catholic wife and in the evening he would worship in his College Chapel.

To many, the most obvious thing about him was the amount of work he got through and in the most competent manner.

His favourite Biblical text might have been that of the great Huxley: 'Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work.' Yet to characterize him as a very hard and competent worker is not to do him full justice. There was a finer quality underlying his activities. The key-note of his life was service, voluntary service, unpretentious and unpaid. Stern duty was not the motive of this service, but devotion to the welfare of that which he served. Some of the posts he held were paid posts—he could not have held them otherwise—but in no case was payment the motive of his service. His service was many-sided. He was an able anthropologist and loyally served in many spheres and in divers manners the youngest of our sciences. Although counting nothing human alien to himself, he patriotically served his country in the Great War as an officer of the Cameron Highlanders and later in the Intelligence Department. As a member of the Oxford City Council 'he did much to establish the friendly relations at present existing between University and City.'

But 'he loved not Man the less if Nature more.' He was a most devoted gardener; not only, like the hero of Voltaire's *Candide*, did he cultivate his own garden strenuously, but he cultivated with no less zeal the gardens of other men. One writes of him in the *Times* of March 9:

> 'When I became curator of the parks, I was astonished to find how much devolved upon the Secretary. It was almost a half-time job to do what was needed on the property in his charge, which included, besides the parks, the land on either side of the Cherwell, the garden in Wellington Square, the grass and borders round the museum departments, and the care of some college gardens which he undertook so as to earn a little money to augment that which he had to spend on the parks. Then there was Parsons' Pleasure, which he took over from a tenant, to the great profit of the University, and the ladies' bathing place below, which he conceived, constructed, and ran. All this without a single penny of reward, and when I went to the competent authority to suggest that the University should assign an honorarium to the Parks Secretary, I was told that it would be a dangerous precedent, that there were others in the University who gave voluntarily of their time—for example, the Acting Curator of the Examination Schools. Defeated (for the moment), I went off to see this public-spirited officer—only to find that his name was Dudley Buxton.'

Yet competent and devoted as he was, he did not become—and it is the danger which besets such characters—either masterful or overbearing. One who knew him well wrote:

'Dons, undergraduates, college servants, park-keepers, and farmers all found him the best of company, while at the same time a competent business man who, just because they liked him, would usually have his way with them in the long run. May he be long remembered as he deserves; for, though cut off prematurely, he had a lifetime's worth of honourable and useful service to his credit.'

A very human saint, a very modern saint; but yet, as a saint, he needs some further descriptive adjective. The hagiologists present us with pillar saints, flagellant saints, royal saints, desert saints, island saints, and many other species. Buxton was pre-eminently a garden saint: a class which does not appear in Hutton's Bampton Lectures nor in Montalembert's romantic volumes, nor, we suspect, even in the ponderous tomes of the Benedictine collection. Buxton is to be classed with Sir Henry Wotton, T. E. Brown of Clifton, and that American poetess who, describing her garden, wrote:

'There I hear a notable clergyman, God,
And His sermons are never long.
So, instead of going to Heaven at last,
I am going all along.'

The Friends of Reunion and their Cross.

The following letter from Dr. Bell, the Bishop of Chichester, in the *Church Times* of March 24, states certain issues so clearly and judiciously that it demands the serious attention of those engaged in promoting reunion in this country. Dr. Bell writes:

Sir,—I so much appreciate the support which you give to the principle of law and order in public worship, that I venture to comment on your reference last week to the annual conference of the Friends of Reunion at Hayward's Heath next month. There are, I think, one or two misunderstandings.

According to the official programme two Communion services are to be held. The first is in the Church of England chapel at Elfinsward, the Diocesan House at Hayward's Heath in which the conference takes place. It is a Church of England service. The programme states, quite accurately, 'At this service, by permission of the Bishop of Chichester, any baptized communicant member of a Christian Church, present at the conference, will be welcome to communicate.'

I gave permission for such a service at a similar conference of the Friends of Reunion in 1938, and have renewed it in 1939. In giving permission I acted in accordance with a resolution of the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation in January, 1933, adopted by that House, after careful consideration of views expressed in the Lower House on an earlier version sent down 'for its consideration and comment' (not concurrence). The resolution ran as follows:

'On special occasions, if and when they arise, when groups of members of the Church of England and of other Christian denominations are joined together in efforts definitely intended to promote the visible unity of the Church of Christ, the Bishop, if requested, may approve of the admission of baptized communicant members of these other denominations to Holy Communion according to the Anglican Rite.'

It will be seen, therefore, that I have acted in full harmony with the deliberate judgment of the bishops of the province; for no one can doubt that the Hayward's Heath Conference of Friends of Reunion is definitely intended to promote the visible unity of the Church of Christ.

The second Communion service is of a different character. It is to be held, not in the Church of England chapel at Elfinsward, but (as the programme makes plain) in Hayward's Heath Congregational Church. It is further, as the programme declares, 'a service of Holy Communion after the manner of the Presbyterian Church to which are invited all who love the Lord Jesus Christ, to whatever branch of the Christian Church they belong.' The service is thus held altogether under Free Church auspices, and is one with which the Bishop of Chichester has neither the right nor the desire to interfere. It is also, I think, right to call attention to the statement in the programme which immediately follows the words just quoted. The programme says:

'Those who are arranging this service are aware that the Lambeth Conference of 1920 and 1930 stated that it should be regarded as the general rule that "members of the Anglican Church should receive the Holy Communion only from ministers of their own Church." Those who feel bound by this declaration are assured that they will, nevertheless, be welcome for an act of spiritual communion.'

Surely, Sir, in the light of these words it can hardly be argued that the announcement implies 'a clear invitation to Anglicans to take part' in the way your paragraph suggests. Here, again, as in duty bound, I follow the ruling of the Bishops of the Upper House, also in January, 1933, and expressed quite deliberately in the following resolution:

'That this House having considered Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference, is of opinion:

That so far as it concerns permission for Anglicans to receive the Holy Communion at the hands of ministers other than those of the Anglican Churches, the Resolution has no application in this Province, inasmuch as the conditions contemplated in it do not exist within the Province.'

I hope that I have made myself plain. On each of the two points which you mention I have implicitly followed the guidance of the Upper House of Convocation in resolutions adopted after considering the advice of the Lower House.

The Palace, Chichester. GEORGE CICESTR:

The situation here set out so clearly may not indicate as close religious relations between English Churchmen and Free Churchmen as existed in Tudor and Stuart times, when all

Nonconformists had, we believe, free access on all occasions to the Holy Communion celebrated in our cathedrals and parish churches, but at least it indicates that the English Church, in this matter, has not become as close a corporation as the Church of Rome. The resolutions which Dr. Bell cites have at least refused to close the door of inter-communion between our Free Church brethren and ourselves. It is true that the door is only opened on rare occasions, and then not very wide, but we live in hope.

Traditionalists versus Modernists.

Modernist clergymen, recently attacked by Lord Hugh Cecil, may well feel grateful for Dr. Inge's championship. Deferential defences, elaborate explanations, are of little use when such attacks are made. It is plainly a case for pungent retort. Such was forthcoming in the *Evening Standard* of February 9:

> 'A prominent Church layman, whose orthodoxy has the stiffness of a poker and its occasional warmth, has come forward again with the old accusation that the Liberal clergy are dishonest men who fall short of the standard of honour which is accepted by respectable laymen.
>
> The clergy, according to this view, are paid advocates who have to speak to their brief. Their brief is to defend the literal and scientific truth of certain dogmatic formulas which were drawn up some fifteen or sixteen hundred years ago. These documents are authoritative for all future time. They cannot be revised or altered except by a General Council of the Church, and since there are several independent Churches, such a Council can never meet.
>
> It is as if no Act of Parliament were valid unless it were passed at a joint session of the House of Commons and the American Congress. The Church therefore can never escape from the tyranny of the dead hand
>
> The charge of dishonesty is offensive and unjust. What possible motive can a man have for opposing the tradition of the elders except the conviction that it is better to suffer for speaking the truth than that the truth should suffer for want of our speaking?
>
> For he has to suffer. It is not pleasant to be abused and hated as a heretic, not only by simple old-fashioned people but by truculent and furious fanatics. It is easy enough to escape this kind of trouble by merely holding our tongues. A man who can hold his tongue can hold anything, even a bishopric.'

Dr. Inge once again reminds Traditionalists of facts which it seems really extraordinary that they should have forgotten or refuse to recognize. These facts point to the truth that the Christian religion is not static but evolutionary and dynamic. He writes:

'Has orthodoxy really stood still ever since the first century? Very far from it. Even in the New Testament we can trace the growth of doctrine about the Person of Christ. It begins with apotheosis and ends with incarnation. . . . In the following centuries the Church carried off into its hive the treasures of Greek philosophy, at first Plato and the Stoics, and later, with the Medieval Schoolmen, Aristotle. In the fourth century, and again in the thirteenth, the Church was fully abreast of the science and philosophy of the day. . . . The change within my own lifetime has been enormous, and we owe it all to brave men who were not afraid to oppose tradition in the name of truth. I can remember the time when a Christian was expected to believe that the world was created only four thousand years before Christ; that every word in the Bible was historical fact; that heaven was a place above our heads, and many other things which only American fundamentalists at Dayton, Tennessee, and similar places, believe now. All this lumber has been swept away during my lifetime. If it had not been swept away, it would be difficult for any educated man to be a Christian.'

Dr. Inge draws attention to a very serious effect of these public strictures pronounced by Traditionalists. They are bound to affect deleteriously the supply of desirable ordinands:

'Complaints are made that men of first-class ability are scarce in the Church. Well, the bishops have only the laity to choose from; but if we are bound hand and foot by obsolete tradition, they will not even get men of high character. They will get only dunces, liars, and bigots. . . . What I think we ought to hope for is that a time may come when a Christian will not be asked to do violence to his intellectual conscience. The demands of Christianity are severe enough, but they do not include what is sometimes called the sacrifice of the intellect.'

A great figure in one of our ancient Universities, who in his day has tutored many ordinands, some of whom have become bishops, has suggested the following radical method for getting rid of these grotesque and detrimental charges of intellectual dishonesty directed against the more courageous and intelligent members of the clerical body. He writes:

'Some years ago I ventured to put a leading question to a rising ecclesiastic (since then promoted to the Bench of Bishops), which I repeated, with less trepidation, not long ago, to an eminent Divine. The question was this: *Why should not our Church admit to Holy Orders any man of adequate knowledge and training, and of satisfactory character, with no further test, or requisition, than a Declaration that he sincerely desires to be ordained, and promises to use loyally the Services of the Church as set forth in the Prayer Book?* The point of the question is that it gets rid of what is probably the chief obstacle to a supply of fit persons for the service of God (and man) in the Church, to wit, the necessity of "Subscription," interpreted as assent to Creeds and Articles of Belief, of which it is safe to say that no one really understands and believes them, exactly and fully in the sense in which they were intended and expressed by their original authors.'

This is a characteristically lay view—not Lord Hugh Cecil's view, nor that of a small but influential group of ecclesiastically-minded laymen—but the view of that larger lay multitude of educated men and women who wish the Church well and desire her to be more influential for good, but who recognize with regret that she and they are getting further and further apart. They feel that those things in the Christian religion in which they do not believe and in which they are almost entirely uninterested are being emphasized at the expense of those things in the Christian religion in which they do believe and are interested. It is true that a number of excellent men are still being ordained, but in many cases their education and outlook are much too narrow to make them influential Christian educationists. The fact that nearly half of those ordained in recent years are without degrees, and that at the last ordination held in the Northern Province only twelve of those ordained were graduates of Oxford or Cambridge, are facts of painful significance. The Church authorities ought to put far more stress on sound education and general culture, and less on ecclesiastical orthodoxy, than is at present the case. What the laity require in their clergy is a well-educated, cultured body of men, possessed of goodwill, wide sympathies, attractive personality, sincerely and self-denyingly devoted to the promotion of Christian ideals and the development of Christian character in our community. If ecclesiastical minutiae and the acceptance of ancient ecclesiastical standards of thought and practice continue to be stressed in the training of ordinands, it must be at the expense of these greater and more precious things.

Professor Burkitt said at the last Conference of Modern Churchmen which he attended before his death :

> 'We in Cambridge in our Theological Tripos offer the Philosophy of Religion as an alternative to Dogmatic Theology. Nearly all our abler candidates choose the Philosophy of Religion, for they are much more concerned with what can be believed than with what has been believed.'

THE IDEA OF A NATIONAL CHURCH*

By the Rev. J. M. Creed, D.D., Ely Professor of Divinity.

'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one flock and one shepherd.'—St. John x, 16.

I.

IF it were incumbent upon Christian teachers to produce scriptural precedent for all that they teach, the task of a Christian preacher seeking, as I do now, to commend to his hearers the idea of a national Church, would indeed be difficult. The idea of a Church at once Christian and national is wholly foreign to the mind of the apostolic age. It is true that the Apostles of Christ, as well as almost all of those who wrote the books which make up the New Testament, had been born into a community which had the characteristics both of a nation and of a Church. But whatever hopes they may have entertained at the outset that their fellow-countrymen would as a whole be brought to acknowledge Jesus as the Christ were quickly disappointed, while from a very early date — perhaps within two or three years of the crucifixion — converts from paganism were being incorporated direct within the Christian community. And this action came to be justified on grounds of principle. Christ's atoning death availed for all who believed. Greek and Jew, so St. Paul argued, stand in the same condition of moral impotence and moral need. The same gospel is to be preached to all alike and in Christ all lesser distinctions are obliterated. 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.' The Apostolic Church was universal and it was not national.

The historian who looks behind the Church's astonishing career of conquest in the Graeco-Roman world can recognize

* This sermon was preached as it stands before the University of Cambridge in Great St. Mary's Church on the first Sunday in Lent, 1939, when I was called upon at very short notice to take the place of a Select Preacher who had fallen sick. Except for some minor changes it is the same as the sermon which I had preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, as Select Preacher before the University at the close of the preceding term on the second Sunday in Advent 1938. J.M.C.

that forces long at work had helped to prepare the way for a universal religion. The conquests of Alexander had created a new sense of the oneness of mankind. Greek culture, originally the distinctive achievement of a group of small kindred states, had become the basis of civilized life through the known world. The Greek language had been transformed into a universal medium for the exchange of ideas. Philosophy too was universalized and individualized: the relation of man to the cosmos rather than the relation of the citizen to his city was the problem of the philosophical schools that followed Aristotle. In the sphere of religion also the individual was less closely bound to his city than he had been. The civic cultus declined in importance, while new worships attracting a voluntary allegiance made their way into all lands.

In a world thus levelled and denationalized and later bound into a political unity by the might of Rome, a universal Church could strike root. We are not to suppose that any or all of these forces will explain the birth of Christianity. Quite certainly they do not. The preaching of the Gospel did not issue from general ideas at all, but on the contrary from a very particular event which alone can account for the cohesion of the new religion. And the particular event was related to a particular people —indeed to the one people whose native force had proved strong enough to resist the solvents of Hellenistic culture. 'Salvation is of the Jews.' Not stoicism, not mystery religions, not Imperial Rome, but national exclusive Judaism is the origin of the Christian religion. If the Christian Church, unlike Judaism, was non-national and inclusive this was not at all because it had yielded to the popular tendencies of the age, but because it found in Jesus Christ, the crucified King of the Jews, a divine disclosure of the relation between God and Man. This is fundamental. Judaism was vanquished from within, not from without.

Yet it remains true that the cosmopolitan Empire of Rome afforded a seed-plot for the growth of a universal Church, perhaps in all history the only possible seed-plot for the growth of a Church which claimed to have a message for the human race. Of whom could it be recorded, except of a Roman Caesar, that he sent out a decree that 'all the inhabited world should be enrolled'?

II.

Whether or not a good parallel to this language could be found from another age and some different civilization, at least it is certain that no parallel is forthcoming from the world as we know it. The universal empire in which the universal Church came to consciousness of its own nature and mission, and from which, in spite of the bitter conflict of the early centuries between Church and State, it derived so much, has wholly disappeared, and its inheritance has passed, not to one, but to many heirs. The head of the present Italian state loves to recall to his people the imperial glories of old Rome, but he is too much of a realist not to know that he can never be to his world what Caesar was to the world of the beginning of our era. He will never be more than one among many, for he is head of a national state, not, in the old sense of the word, of an Empire. In this respect at least Mussolini inherits from Mazzini and Cavour, not from the Emperors of Rome.

In our own time we have witnessed the disappearance of the last European state which retained something of the old imperial tradition. The dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary won the admiration of Lord Acton precisely because it made nationality and state two different things. The union of nations in a single imperial state seemed to him to provide the necessary corrective of the modern obsession with Nationalism. Now that has gone, and all the world over, not in Europe only but in Asia too, the tide sets strongly towards the National state. Even the Communist International has become less international in its aims and policy than it was, and perhaps it is settling down to make a new kind of national state. The world we live in has no common political organization. If ever it is to achieve one, it seems clear that it must be one which pre-supposes and co-ordinates the national groupings which already exist.

III.

I introduce into a sermon these rather obvious reflections on a state of affairs with which we are only too familiar, because I wish to draw from them certain inferences, which are less familiar than I think they ought to be, as to the forms of Church

polity which are to-day appropriate for the Christian religion as a universal faith.

First, let it be asserted that in this, as in all other spheres, a Christian doctrine must seek to satisfy the fundamental conditions involved in the Apostolic preaching of Jesus Christ to which the New Testament is our primary witness; and secondly, let it be conceded that a direct transference of New Testament attitudes to our own time is impossible. If any be disposed to question the necessity of the concession, it is enough to call in evidence the Jews. In St. John's Gospel the Jews have a double significance: they are the bearers of the true faith in God; they are also in the superlative degree the enemies of God and of His true people, who have done to death God's last and greatest messenger. Now the Jews are with us still, but the attitude to which I have just now referred is inapplicable to the present relations of Church and Synagogue. It is not reasonable to-day to regard Judaism as a chief enemy of the Church, and it is intolerable to the conscience of the contemporary Church to link the present misfortunes of that unhappy race with the part it played in the history of the rise of our religion.

Something of the same kind holds good of the universalism of the New Testament. It, too, is not capable of direct, but only of indirect, application to ourselves. The universalism of the New Testament is almost always conditioned by a conscious antithesis to Jewish Nationalism: 'Other sheep I have which are not of this — the Jewish — fold.' The universalism takes concrete form in the primitive Catholic Church through missionary activity among the non-Jewish denationalized inhabitants of the Graeco-Roman world. ' . . . them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one flock and one shepherd.'

In a very interesting essay on 'The missionary methods of the ancient and of the mediaeval Church,'[1] Karl Holl has pointed out that the early Church moved almost wholly within ἡ οἰκουμένη, *i.e.* the Roman Empire. (The spread of Christianity to Edessa is an exception, but it scarcely effects the general truth of this limitation.) There were no 'missionaries' as we know them — that is, specially trained evangelists for

[1] Karl Holl *Gesammelte Aufsätze sur Kirchengeschichte* III Der Westen (Tübingen 1928), pp. 117 ff.

foreign lands. Christians did not go to foreign lands. The wide stretches of the Empire afforded room enough and its boundaries included all that mattered. Within these boundaries every Christian was a missionary more or less, trying to seek out 'the scattered children of God' and to bring them within the Church. Before two generations had passed the Gospel had won converts in almost every land. The Church was ubiquitous throughout the world, *i.e.* within the boundaries of the Roman Imperium.

There lies the difference between the first centuries and ourselves. For us there is no unified οἰκουμένη. In place of one Empire we have a multiplicity of National States.

It serves no useful purpose to quarrel with our lot. The nation is there, and we must make the best of it. Accepting, therefore, this condition of mankind as a necessary datum, we are obliged to recognize that a Church, if it is to be universal, cannot be purely negative in its attitude towards the nation. It cannot simply repudiate it as the early Catholic Church repudiated the nationalism of the Old Covenant. For though no one nation is universal, nationalism is universal, and all possible members of the universal Church must also be citizens of some one nation.

The difficulties inherent in the position are obviously very grave — so grave that we are perhaps justified in doubting whether, if the idea of a universal Church had not been already in the field, it could have been successfully initiated in our age. Fortunately that is a question which we need not stay to consider, for wherever Christianity exists at all — and it exists almost everywhere — some conception of the Church as in principle a universal fellowship is present. The Son of Man has not been lifted from the earth in vain; he has drawn to himself so many men, so many different kinds of men, that, however weak and vacillating our conduct may be, the idea is not itself in peril.

But the problem of its embodiment in an age of nationalism is not an easy one. National frontiers should not be a bar to religious fellowship. They should not hamper our consciousness of mankind as constituting a unity, a unity which, for Christian belief, has its counterpart in the Church of Christ, which is nothing else than the race redeemed in Christ. At the same time we must allow for the fact that to mankind at large, ourselves included, these frontiers are no mere impediments to a common

life, but rather necessary conditions of the common life which it desires. However close the intercourse between one nation and another, each remains and wishes to remain distinct. Especially in the higher activities of mankind — art, literature, philosophy — the nation is the medium. The universal is also national. New forces and ideas only attain to universal currency by consenting to be incorporated in the life of the nation.

What is true of art, literature and philosophy is not less true of religion and of the Christian religion. This seems now to find widespread recognition. Missionaries of the Christian religion among Eastern peoples are feeling keenly the necessity of making contact with national modes of living and thinking, and they have grown aware of the danger — a danger which they have not yet succeeded in circumventing — of imposing upon their converts divisions which have their origin and explanation in conditions peculiar to the West. The aim which is now often avowed is to encourage the convert Churches to become national Churches — conscious, because they are parts of the Church of Christ, of the universal mission of Christ, but conscious also of themselves as the servants for Christ's sake, in an especial sense, of their own countrymen. Pitfalls abound. Mistakes have been made. Mistakes will be made again. But the main trend of policy is likely to remain such as I have described.

In the world as we know it there is an overwhelming case for National Churches of some sort. For in our world universal and national are not antithetical but complementary ideas. The national may in an excess of misguided zeal refuse the universal, but the idea which claims universality must consent to work through the national.

IV.

We teach others, but have we learnt the lesson for ourselves? Certainly ours is a different problem from that of the Churches of Asia. In the West Christianity has been for centuries part and parcel of our civilization, and in the last few centuries our civilization has been emancipating itself from forms of thought and of social organization which the world-Church adopted and fostered in the Middle Age. It is a plausible, but not really a tenable, view that this emancipation has been a sheer discarding of the Christian Gospel itself. For my present purpose I must

be content to assume that this facile interpretation is not sound; that the mediaeval synthesis was a stage, and not an irreformable culmination, in Christian history. If this be granted, then for us too the national Church is a true and proper form of ecclesiastical polity.

National Church polities may and do vary indefinitely. I wish now to say a word about our own.

By name, history and character the Church of England is a national Church. It has been and it still is intimately bound up with the constitution and life of the English nation. With us, though the Church and the State have distinct functions in the life of the community, it is not possible to draw a clear line of demarcation between them. Each helps to determine the character of the other.

The ministry of the Word and the Sacraments is reserved to the clergy, but the conditions under which they exercise their ministry are settled partly by Canons of the Clerical Convocations discussed and promulgated under Royal authority, but for the most part by laws enacted by King and Parliament. Ordination to the Ministry and Consecration to the Episcopate are purely Church rites in which the State takes no direct part. But it is reserved to the King on the advice of his chief minister to settle on which of the clergy the higher offices shall be bestowed. On the other hand the Church also has its appointed place in the nation and in the State. The King himself, though under modern constitutional theory he becomes King at once on the death of the King, yet receives the crown and consecration to his office at the hands of the chief Bishop of the Church. Archbishops and Bishops are not required or expected to confine themselves to any narrow interpretation of their ministry. They are a part of the Legislature and in their several dioceses they fulfil many functions beyond the strictly ecclesiastical duties which are their primary care. At least equally important is the position of the parish clergyman. Here too the same tradition exists. The best type of Anglican clergyman has never been a pure ecclesiastic. The ministry of Word and Sacraments is his first duty, but he also shares in, often he becomes a leader in, the common social activities of the community.

Such are some of the recognizable marks of the actual

Church of England, as it has been and as it is to-day. Our Church polity is certainly not the only possible type of polity for a national Church. It is not a type which could be easily transplanted in its entirety to another country with another tradition, or with no tradition; it is especially open to certain dangers and temptations; but it has its own peculiar merits. We must start from where we are, and, when change is proposed, one question which it is right to ask is how the proposed change would affect our polity in its national aspect? That is the question which I wish to put to those who are now advocating the elimination or the weakening of the position of King and Parliament (the two must be treated together) in our ecclesiastical system.

I do not see how a reassuring answer could be given. I have not forgotten, though I have not yet mentioned, our Church Assembly. Here I would pay my tribute to the devoted work which many clerics and laymen have there given to the administration of the Church. But I say with little fear of serious contradiction that the Church Assembly, as it is, is quite inadequate to sustain the character of the Church of England as a National Church. The co-operation of King and Parliament — co-operation which they themselves do not seem disposed to refuse — is indispensable.

V.

The general lines on which I would defend the idea of a national Church will by now have become plain. Let me as I close adduce another and an urgent reason why we should not only not weaken but should actively foster the idea of a national Church. The universal, we have contended, must needs work through the national, but there is no inherent necessity for the national to lend itself to the universal. The gravest danger of our time is the rise of a cult of nationalism which exalts the particular national state as the all-sufficing object of the citizen's allegiance and devotion. For this unbridled nationalism, the State, or the supreme leader of the State, hovers on the verge of apotheosis. Any qualification in the devotion — nay the adoration — accorded to it or to him is made to wear the aspect of disloyalty. Such a nationalism spurns any attempt to think of the human race as one, and inevitably it finds itself in conflict

with the Christian conception of the Church as the unity of God's children dispersed throughout the world.

A national Church polity is a preservative against these aberrations. If the head of the State himself acknowledges his own independence upon a power beyond, he disavows the Divinity of the State and encourages in his people the attitude of reverence and awe before a power greater than themselves and greater than he. *Dominus regnavit.* No earthly monarch stands with Him — save only one, who was a lowly man, whose crown on earth was a crown of thorns.

To save us from this modern paganism is not the least of the services which a national Church polity may help to render to ourselves and to mankind.

THE CHRISTIAN PLATONISTS OF CAMBRIDGE

By the Rev. A. W. Adams, M.A., Chaplain of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

THERE is no class of literature, perhaps, on which the dust of time settles so thickly as the theology of past ages. The erudition with which the divines of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries packed their pages lies entombed between the leather of their folio or quarto bindings, as securely as if it had been laid in the grave with their learned authors. A few, like Donne or Launcelot Andrewes or Jeremy Taylor, have in these latter days been resurrected for the felicities of their prose style. But there has been nothing like a general resurrection even of these great men, and they must be content, for the most part, with the few pages allotted to them in the prose anthologies. Of the few who are still remembered for what they had to say as much as for the way in which they said it, among the most notable are Richard Hooker (at the end of the previous century) and the group of 'Latitude men' generally known as the Cambridge Platonists. And the connection between them and Hooker is not fortuitous. At this time in England, as in all the reformed countries, the place of supreme authority had passed from the Church to the Scriptures. But the danger to religion

which must come from complete submission to any uncriticized authority was not lessened by the change. In their attempt to redress the balance by insisting on the place of Reason in religion alongside of Church and Bible, the Cambridge men are in the direct line of succession from the judicious author of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. But whereas for Hooker it was Scripture first, Reason second, with Church and Tradition coming after, the Cambridge Platonists put Reason in the first place and made it the ultimate authority in religion. 'To go against Reason,' wrote Whichcote, 'is to go against God; it is the self-same to do that which the reason of the case doth require, and that which God Himself doth appoint. Reason is the Divine Governour of man's life; it is the very voice of God.' More is equally emphatic: '. . . he that takes away the use of reason in religion undermines Christianity, and laies it as low as the basest Superstition that ever appeared in the world.'

The pre-eminence assigned to the Reason was the outcome, not of an exaggerated intellectualism, but of their high evaluation of man's nature. In this respect their theology is like a splash of bright sunlight in the surrounding gloom of Calvinism. The eye of Reason may have been weakened by the Fall, so that it sees but dimly. But it has not been blinded. 'The eye could never behold the sun if it were not like it. The mind of man could never contemplate God, if it be not God-like; for (as in Nature) so there must be a suitable disposition of the faculty and the object,' wrote Whichcote. In the matter of human reprobation the Christian Platonists of Cambridge, like the ever-memorable John Hales, 'bade good-night to John Calvin.' There was thus no need to drive a wedge between natural and revealed religion, nor was it necessary to rely solely on the latter—the two go hand in hand. 'In the Bible,' said Whichcote, 'there are these two things: the consonancy of the things therein contained with the things of natural knowledge, and the report there made of God, agreeable to what Reason leads men to think.' Consequently they rejected the crude bibliolatry of the times. 'Scripture as a rule of faith is not one text, but all'—'not so much the words as the sense, that sense which is verified by other scriptures. For you may take it for granted that there is no matter of faith, or duty, that stands upon the authority of a

single text. . . . God expects that the reader of Scripture should be of an ingenious spirit, and use candour . . .' In short, 'Scripture is to be taken in a rational sense.'

What was this rational faculty which the Cambridge men held so sacred? For Whichcote and his followers it was much more than 'intellective processes'; it included the moral and spiritual, as well as the rational in the narrower sense. 'The oracle of God,' wrote Henry More, 'is not to be heard but in his holy temple — that is to say, in a good and holy man, thoroughly sanctified in spirit, soul and body.' And again, 'If thou beest it, thou seest it.' Consequently the moral faculty and the moral element in religion are of the greatest importance. The truly moral life is the life lived according to man's true nature, which in turn is the life lived according to Reason. 'It is the proper employment of our intellectual faculties to be conversant about God, to conceive aright of Him, and then to resemble and imitate Him.' 'Christ was a master of life, not of the schools,' Cudworth once said from the pulpit, 'and he is the best Christian whose heart beats with the purest pulse towards heaven; not he whose head spins the finest cobwebs.'

In all these respects Whichcote and the rest are in the mainstream of the Platonic — or rather neo-Platonic — tradition in theology, though they were by no means slavish followers of their intellectual forbears. Perhaps their greatest characteristic, certainly that which most distinguished them from their acrimonious contemporaries, was their spirit of toleration and sweet reasonableness. The 'Latitude men,' as they were called — not without suspicion in many quarters — almost alone in their age represented the true Anglican temper which, disastrously for the Church of England, was little in evidence at the Restoration. This temper again was a consequence of their faith in Reason and reasonableness as the only way in religion. They were for 'moderation and persuasion toward all opponents.' 'God applies to our faculties, and deals with us by reason and argument. Let us learn of God to deal with one another in meekness, calmness and reason, and so represent God,' wrote Whichcote. 'True zeal,' said Cudworth in a sermon before the House of Commons in 1647, 'is a sweet, heavenly and gentle flame which maketh us active for God, but always within the sphere of love.' 'Univer-

sal charity,' said Whichcote again, 'is a thing final in religion.' The most clear-sighted in this respect was Whichcote, of whom Dr. de Pauley,[1] the most recent writer on the Cambridge Platonists, says:

> '[his] faith in the Christian temper is as deep as his faith in Reason; and he believes that when the two are combined, peace will come to the Church. Where differences prevail, the first thing to be done is to secure agreement upon essentials, and these have been clearly taught in Scripture. Then it must be recognized that the only unessentials worth discussing are those which can be employed to further the end for which the essentials stand. And if agreement cannot be arrived at concerning them, the only course is to agree that there are many ways of achieving the same end' (p.34).

Would that this temper were more widespread to-day! But as a Church we have still to grasp the meaning of Whichcote's aphorisms: 'Truth lies in a little compass and narrow room. Vitals in religion are few.' 'Truth is truth whoever speaks it . . . because it is not his but God's.' 'The state of religion lies, in short, in this; a good mind, and a good life. All else is about religion.'

The literature which has grown up round the Cambridge Platonists, and includes such names as Tulloch (*Rational Theology in the Seventeenth Century*, 1872) Dr. Inge (*The Platonic Tradition in English Theology*, 1926), F. J. Powicke (*The Cambridge Platonists*, 1926), and a slighter but excellent study with the same title by G. P. H. Pawson (1930), has been enriched by a notable contribution from Dr. W. C. de Pauley, who is Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Toronto. Dr. de Pauley's book is much more than a review of those points in the teaching of the Cambridge Platonists which still make an appeal to the modern mind, in spite of the revolutionary changes which have come over philosophy, theology and psychology since their day. Rather his aim has been to provide a systematic exposition of the theology of each member of the group in turn, with special reference to the cross-currents of seventeenth-century ideas, and in particular the reactions of the Cambridge men to the 'new philosophy' of Descartes, Hobbes and Locke. In this aim he has succeeded admirably, and his book will repay careful study by anyone who wishes to gain a deeper insight into the Golden Age of Anglican theology.

[1] *The Candle of the Lord.* By W. C. de Pauley, D.D. (S.P.C.K., 1937; pp. 248. 7/6.)

THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN INTERPRETATION AND RESEARCH: SOME RECENT BOOKS

By C. J. Wright, B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Didsbury College, Manchester.

THREE recently published books: *An Introduction to the Fourth Gospel*[1] by E. B. Redlich, *Readings in St. John's Gospel*[2] by W. Temple, *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels*[3] by P. Gardner-Smith indicate the intense interest which is now being taken, both by the student and by the intelligent Christian layman, in that Gospel which was so rightly called by Clement of Alexandria the 'spiritual Gospel.' The reasons for this interest are many. Most Christian people feel that the Fourth Gospel makes a contribution to their spiritual life which they find nowhere else. The thoughtful among them, however, are perplexed by the problems which a critical and historical study of it presents. They want to know how much of it is history and how much of it is what is customarily called 'interpretation.' They note its divergencies from the Synoptic Gospels and ask how these have to be understood. The old-fashioned 'harmonies' do not answer their inquiries: like sea water, they mock the thirst instead of quenching it.

The books referred to above are written for, and will appeal to, different bodies of readers. Canon Redlich's book is written as an introduction to the main problems presented by the Fourth Gospel. It may be commended as a useful volume which sets forth in an orderly and concise way the data which have to be kept in mind by those who would reach conclusions on 'The Riddle of Authorship' and 'The Riddle of Historicity.' Mr. Redlich finds it difficult to make up his mind on authorship, concluding that the Apostle John was either the full and direct

[1] *An Introduction to the Fourth Gospel.* By E. B. Redlich. (Longmans. 1939. 5/-.)

[2] *Readings in St. John's Gospel.* First Series. By W. Temple. (Macmillan. 1939. 8/6.)

[3] *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels.* By P. Gardner-Smith. (Cambridge University Press. 1938. 5/-.)

author or the partial and indirect author, inclining to the latter view. On the issues raised by Symbolism and Allegory — the crucial issue — Mr. Redlich seems to be in a similar difficulty, but tends to traditionalist conclusions. His treatment of the Cana story will sufficiently illustrate his attitude. His view is that Jesus turned water into wine, but not so much as the evangelist may be held to suggest. 'It may have been the quantity held by a bucket.'

Archbishop Temple's book is of a more popular type. It is not easy to characterize it in a phrase. It is not a detailed exposition of the part of the Gospel with which it deals — namely, chapters I—XII. Yet essentially it *is* exposition, and exposition from a traditionalist standpoint. By 'traditionalist' is here meant an exposition in support of the dogmatic formulas and main apologetic position represented by those formulas. Nothing which Dr. Temple writes is uninteresting: and those who are familiar with his many previous books will wish to read these fragmentary meditations and reflections on the Gospel which, with many who do not share his dogmatic position, he regards as 'the profoundest of all writings.' As indicative of the 'catholicity' of Dr. Temple's mind is the fact that he has dedicated the volume to the late Professor J. L. Stocks. In a brief Introduction the authorship is ascribed to John the Elder, intimate disciple of John the Apostle. Some of the salient issues raised by the Gospel are also briefly discussed. In this Introduction we read a characteristic parenthetical aside of Dr. Temple. 'Why anyone,' he exclaims, 'should have troubled to crucify the Christ of Liberal Protestantism has always been a mystery.' It is unfortunate that such a descent to popular declamatory and defamatory innuendo was sanctioned by the Archbishop in a serious book. It invites the unchristian retort that those who make such statements would certainly have been among those who *did* crucify Jesus. Dr. Temple must be aware that the phrase 'the Christ of Liberal Protestantism' is as much a question-begging phrase as the phrases 'the Christ of Catholic Modernism,' 'the Christ of Form-criticism,' 'the Christ of obscurantist traditionalism,' 'the Christ of modern Apollinarianism,' and many others which might be suggested. The

reader who believes that an author's essential mind is revealed not by his careful utterances but by his parenthetical asides will be disturbed.

The substance of Dr. Temple's book is, as we have said, his expositions. These are characterized by the intellectual rescourcefulness which Dr. Temple's readers have learned to expect. In fragmentary 'Readings' detailed and adequate exegesis will not, of course, be expected. The reader who does not share the author's dogmatic certitudes will not, however, appreciate the numerous sweeping statements on highly debatable points. To my own view Dr. Temple's interpretation of the mind of the evangelist is vitiated by a fundamental misconception of that mind. He reads into the utterances of a spiritual seer the dogmatic finalities of the theologian.

This misconception — as I conceive it — is so firmly planted in the minds of rationalistic theologians both of the right and of the left that there is little hope of its ever being extirpated. It is a matter of ultimate quality of mind. To both right and left wing theological rationalists the Fourth Evangelist is the father of metaphysical theology. The right wing rationalists seem to find this type of theology — expressed in the 'final' dogmas of the fourth and fifth centuries — essential as an answer to theistic doubts, and retreat to the security of the dogmatic haven with the fond supposition that the Fourth Evangelist shared their own mental characteristics. The left wing rationalists are unable to find security in the dogmatic haven, and, acquiescing in the traditionalist interpretation — or, as I should say, misinterpretation — of St. John, regard him as 'beginning the degeneration of spiritual religion into theological superstition.'

A few illustrations of what I have called Dr. Temple's misconceptions will suffice. Interpreting the saying in i, 14, 'the Word became flesh,' he writes: 'The Word did not merely indwell a human being. Absolute identity is asserted. The Word is Jesus; Jesus is the Word.' I regard this 'absolute identity' as the dogmatic theologian's unimaginative interpretation of a dramatic poet, as I have said at length elsewhere. Applying this unimaginative canon of interpretation to the use of the verbs 'to become' and 'to be' by poets and seers, we shall make them the authors of absurdities.

Dr. Temple's interpretation of the Johannine 'signs' is such as those who know his writings will expect. They are to be interpreted literally. Real water is changed into real wine: 'the Creator of matter is exercising His lordship over it.' The story of Lazarus is 'undoubtedly miraculous'; so that a man's body, from the moment of real physical death, is rendered insusceptible to the disintegrative forces which elsewhere are universally operative, and, in response to a command by Jesus, emerges from the tomb, though bound. Real bread is 'created' at the incident of 'the feeding of the multitude': Dr. Temple has no doubt that a 'creative act' really occurred. His certitude on these issues is, he tells us frankly, decided by his Christology.

> 'If the Lord was indeed God incarnate, the story presents no insuperable difficulties. But of course such a creative act is quite incredible if He is other or less than God incarnate.'

It is, of course, impossible for a reviewer to discuss all the apologetic and exegetical issues involved in Dr. Temple's position. But, lest mere citation by the reviewer should imply the adoption of the evasive and 'safety first' maxim, I would express my own view that the exegesis of the evangelist's mind is as mistaken as the apologetic is dubious.

In confining myself to a critical estimate of a few of Dr. Temple's main positions, I do not forget his many valuable comments. His works, however, are so well known that these latter may be taken for granted. Attention needs to be directed to fundamental issues.

Mr. Gardner-Smith's book is very different from the other two. It is a book for critical students of the Gospels. His central thesis is that the Fourth Evangelist did not, as is customarily held, know, and make use, of St. Mark and St. Luke. He undertakes a close examination of passages in St. John's Gospel where the influence of the above-mentioned synoptic evangelists has been discerned, and concludes:

> 'When all the facts are taken into consideration it becomes difficult to believe that the author of the Fourth Gospel was familiar with those Gospels which are generally thought to have been written and given to the Church before he undertook his task. Perhaps some of those who have followed our examination may be surprised to find how

slender is the evidence on which the common belief of St. John's dependence upon the Synoptists rests, and how weighty are the objections to be urged against it, even in the case of Mark.'

Mr. Gardner-Smith's thesis is, as he knows very well, in opposition to a considerable body of critical opinion — that of Streeter, B. W. Bacon and many others. This is a realm in which the present reviewer fears to tread. I imagine that Mr. Gardner-Smith has, like Dr. Torrey with his Aramaic hypothesis, given the labourers in the field of Gospel criticism a substantial lump to chew. So many inter-related problems are here involved. For example: When was the Fourth Gospel written? Who wrote it? Did the evangelist use *any* pre-existing written sources, and, if so, of what precise origin and nature? And how far is it dependent upon, and related to, the oral traditions of the life of Jesus on which the Church must have so greatly depended during the first generations? These are but a few of the many questions which arise, and the answer to them will have a considerable bearing both upon Mr. Gardner-Smith's theory of independence and the prevailing theory of dependence.

Mr. Gardner-Smith does well to emphasize two points often overlooked in critical discussions. First, the dependence of the Church in the first generations upon *oral tradition*. Second, the significant *differences* between St. John on the one hand and St. Mark and St. Luke on the other. The fact that the three evangelists use in places the same, or similar, language does not *of itself* prove the dependence of one upon the others. Nor does the fact of differences, and of agreements, *of itself* either (in the first case) prove independence, or (in the second case) prove dependence. For the Fourth Evangelist may, in the first case, have had his own reasons for differing from Gospels familiar to him; and he may, in the second case, have been familiar with oral traditions with which the other two were also familiar — in which case the agreements are explained otherwise than by literary dependence.

I fear this is an issue which, with the data available, is incapable of confident determination. It is, at least, transparently obvious to every reader of the Fourth Gospel that it was written in striking independence of any other existing works known to us.

Whether the evangelist had other Gospels in his mind when he himself wrote, at least we may be certain that he was not one of the authors who write their books with numerous volumes open before them for reference and assistance. A book like the Fourth Gospel is not thus written. Great works of art are the creations of artists.

It would have been interesting if Mr. Gardner-Smith had sought to relate his own study, with the conclusion that there is a *prima facie* case for putting the Fourth Gospel before the First and Third, to the work of Dr. Torrey, with his theory of the early date of all the Gospels.

It is obvious, I think, that the Fourth Gospel focuses at a vivid point many of the burning issues of contemporary Christian thought. Nothing less is at stake than the essence of Christianity. To my own view there is very much more conscious symbolism in this Gospel than Mr. Redlich and Dr. Temple will admit. The key to its interpretation is, I believe, the type of mind possessed by the author. He is a *theologos*, but is very far removed from the type of mind suggested by 'theologian.' He is a 'mystical' prophet, not a rationalistic theologian. To understand him the Old Testament will help us more than Hellenic and Hellenistic thought. I am well aware of the antipathetical reactions of a certain type of 'theologian' to the suggestion that the Fourth Evangelist is a 'mystic': there is, however, a quality in his mind which can be most fittingly thus described. Further, there is a moral quality in his mind which throbs through all that he has written. No one can read this Gospel sympathetically without seeing that the Evangelist loved Truth much more than Institution, and that he hated nothing so much as the hidden lie of the inmost mind and motive. In this he had drunk deeply of the spirit of our Lord Himself. The late Dr. Bernard Bosanquet said truly that the Fourth Gospel 'brings insight into the spirit of Christ to its highest perfection.' But I am unable to believe that our Evangelist was responsible for the transmutation of the ethical and spiritual emphasis of Jesus into a speculative system of human thought, by assenting to which, it was held, salvation and eternal life are to be found.

EVANGELISM AND THE FILM

The Rev. T. H. W. Maxfield, M.A., Vicar of St. Saviour's Church, Denmark Park, S.E.

IT is often asserted by modern Churchmen, particularly by those living in academic circles, that the main need of the Church is doctrinal and liturgical reform. It would be an undoubted gain if the sixth aim of our Union were achieved and we had secured more regard for beauty and truth in Church Services, and the use of language and customs in harmony with modern thought. Yet such revision would probably have little immediate effect on the greatest problem of the town parish, the problem of the empty pews. The writer has some years experience of work in a parish containing an L.C.C. Slum Clearance Estate which has added some 5,000 people to the population. It is probably fairly typical of the London estates; and the utter disregard of all organized religion, except for Churchings, Baptisms and Marriages, is to those responsible little less than heartrending. After the most careful visiting by clergy and lay workers, there are not one per cent. of the adults who attend the services provided by the Book of Common Prayer. The women can be drawn in considerable numbers into a Women's Fellowship, some of the children are glad to join Scouts, Guides, or Clubs, the men are happy to co-operate with churchfolk in the formation of a Community Association, but attend church, except for the occasions mentioned, no!

Sixteen years' work in industrial areas has convinced the writer that all religious bodies, not excepting the Salvation Army, are tied to a technique of presenting religious truth which is ineffective and largely obsolete as a means of reaching our great urban population. The one evangelistic method used in the average parish is the sermon, valuable while the habit of 'sermon-tasting' was widespread, but now increasingly ineffective save for the edification of 'the faithful.' In London and the larger towns the advent of the cycle, the motor-car, and the cheap excursion has meant that in the summer the young folk (and who can blame them?) spend Sunday in the country, or

visiting friends in the suburbs. In the winter they are more likely to be in the parish, but it is only the few whom inclination or habit lead to church. Large queues line up for Sunday cinemas, while pews remain empty.

We need to face facts. The new age and the changed habits require a new technique of evangelism. Our present methods, admirable for the days of Wesley and Spurgeon, are not reaching more than a fraction of our huge urban populations of to-day. It was the evidence of the attraction of Sunday cinemas which led the writer three years ago to try what could be done by showing religious films in church. There were at that time very few suitable films available, and a start was made with silent films. These 'Film Services' were held monthly, and consisted of shortened Evening Prayer, film, and short evangelistic address. The response was immediate; empty pews filled, and during the three years the congregation has always been double, and sometimes treble, that attending Evening Prayer on other Sundays. Sound films have been used during the last two years. These need to be made with a view to use in church; not all the orchestral accompaniment, even in the Religious Film Society's films, is suitable for an Anglican service; but some of the best congregational singing the writer ever heard has been to the accompaniment of the loud speaker, the sound of which is drowned by the voices of the congregation, except for those in the front pews, so that the general effect is that of unaccompanied singing, with all self-consciousness gone in the darkened church, to the words of a well-known hymn on the screen.

The Religious Film Society now has its own film studio at Norwood, and in spite of real difficulties has made a courageous start with the production of films. The St. Paul series has already shown the possibilities of the dramatisation of Biblical narratives. If the 'Road to Damascus,' dealing with the Conversion of St. Paul, is not too convincing, 'Faith Triumphant' (St. Paul's arrest and defence before Agrippa) is a real advance, while 'The Way of Salvation' (St. Paul and Silas at Philippi) is outstanding for its fine characterisation of the apostle. There are not many Old Testament films at present, but 'The Call of Samuel' points the way. New Testament parables are represented by 'The Sower,' an excellent little film

by the Gaumont British Instructional unit. The G.B. nature films are all good and suitable, in the writer's opinion, for use in church. Christian biography offers obvious scope for film treatment, and 'David Livingstone,' an older silent film, and 'William Tindale,' a judicious combination of the documentary and the dramatic, both show what can be achieved. A series of twenty-four Biblical background films, produced for educational purposes by School Films, Ltd., is nearing completion. These are being used with advantage in churches. As they are silent films, they could be accompanied with an address based on the part of the Bible in question. The real aim of the film in church is to give an illustrated sermon. All idea of entertainment should be excluded, but there is no reason why religious instruction and edification should not be made interesting by every means available. The experiment has proved that large numbers of people, young and old, can be attracted and held by this method. The need of teaching and preaching is not discarded, but is assisted by the film. If in the past the film has been used largely for entertainment, and not always of the best style, it must be remembered that film projectors are now being provided in increasing numbers in schools, and in days to come the film is likely to be regarded as a normal method of teaching. Will the church rise to seize so potent a means of spreading its message? It will need all the technical skill available for the writing of scenarios and for the production of the inspired films we require. It will need the diversion of resources of money and energy from less profitable enterprises into this fruitful field. We must not overestimate the possibilities of the film, which can only be a handmaid to the preaching of the Gospel, but neither can we afford to neglect a method which has passed the experimental stage and proved its efficacy. It is not too much to say that a single reel of film can be more effective to-day than a whole course of sermons.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHEERFUL DOCTOR*

'In the days when the guttersnipes of Fleet Street were pelting me with mud as a pessimist, I never dreamed of anything so terrible and so menacing as the state of Europe to-day.'

So says Dr. Inge on the first page of his introduction to the volume of reprints of his articles in the *Evening Standard,* a volume which, borrowing a title from Burke, he has called *Our Present Discontents.* The phrase, 'the guttersnipes of Fleet Street,' suggests a certain resentment against the popular journals of thirty years ago, those journals which according to a gibe of Lord Salisbury, were written 'by office boys for office boys.' Yet, after all, it was the guttersnipes aforesaid who made the Dean of St. Paul's a national figure. The fact is doubtless regrettable and reflects little credit on our intelligence. Dr. Inge had a quarter of a century ago a European reputation for his studies on Platonism. Dr. Seton Watson in his recently published *History of Roumania* relates that in Paris at the time of the Versailles Treaty he tried to 'draw' a Roumanian statesman on his country's policy, and that the latter persisted in discussing Dean Inge's studies on Plotinus as being far more profitable than the inanities of European politics. Unfortunately, the average Englishman has never heard of Plotinus, and the word 'Platonic' merely suggests a speech for the defence in a divorce suit. It was the 'Gloomy Dean' and not the Christian Platonist who captured the imagination of the multitude, and the guttersnipes (some of them have probably been knighted by now) may congratulate themselves on their journalistic 'flair' in spotting a favourite and, perhaps, smile sardonically as the former Dean joins their ranks and finds a wayside pulpit in a daily paper. 'He who was once a pillar of St. Paul's is now a column in the *Evening Standard.*'

At the same time we appreciate, and to a certain extent agree with, Dr. Inge's disclaimer of the title of pessimist. We always suspected that his outlook was not as black as it was painted. His last volume of articles or sermonettes was called *A Rustic Moralist.* The title may seem a little incongruous; perhaps it is intended to mark the transition from the rush of Dean's Court to the peace of Brightwell Manor. But Dr. Inge was brought up in the country and in the county of York; the countryman, and particularly the Yorkshire countryman, likes to look on the dark side of things, to contemplate the crops, prices, the weather, through an atmosphere of inspissated gloom, but at the back of his mind there lurks a conviction that things are not as bad as all that. Dean Inge tried hard to be a weeping philosopher, but, as with Dr. Johnson's friend, cheerfulness

* *Our Present Discontents.* By William Ralph Inge, formerly Dean of St. Paul's. (Putnam. 351 pp. 1938. 7/6.)

would keep breaking in. Perhaps it would be fairer to say that the man of vision who has seen the storm gathering afar off is not unduly surprised and dismayed when the sky is dark and the thunder rolls. Isaiah was derided as a pessimist by the giddy and thoughtless, but when the crisis of Sennacherib's invasion came, and all around him was dismay, he was the one optimist.

From the standpoint of 1939 the present volume is quite cheerful, we had almost said light, reading. It is agreeable to find the erstwhile Gloomy Dean dallying with the Servant Problem.

> 'I should get some ladies to design a perfectly sweet uniform for them. The girls would be treated in the same way as governesses, typists or secretaries. They would be Miss X until they and their employers had come, by mutual agreement, to Christian name terms.'

Even the chapter on Starving the Clergy (though the subject has admittedly its graver side) has a pleasant old-world flavour about it; the poor creatures and their wives have been starving so long that they must be quite used to it by now, and the tone of the articles suggests that the old order of the English countryside is going to persist under improved (or deteriorated) conditions. Some of us were beginning to fear that the earth might open her mouth and swallow up the whole thing.

We read in the Introduction, which must have been written when the clouds were darkest over Europe,

> 'In the opinion of most thinkers on the Continent, and of many at home, we are on the brink of the abyss which may plunge us into a dark age such as followed the break-up of the ancient civilisation.'

The writer, however, thinks that

> 'terrible though a downfall of the West would be, it would not destroy the traditions on which civilisation rests, and which would ensure its recovery. The New World has its own problems, but it is not in danger of ruin, either by foreign conquest or by internal revolution. This is true of our own Dominions as well as of the United States and South America.'

That America can turn its back on Europe and carry on the tradition of freedom and culture in isolation does not seem to be the opinion of Franklin Roosevelt; his Presidential Message points rather to a solidarity between the Old and the New World. There are two considerations which make us doubt Dr. Inge's reassuring verdict. First, there is a grave doubt whether American and Australian culture are sufficiently strong on the intellectual and spiritual side to persist without serious impoverishment when severed from the parent stem. Secondly, there seems strong reason to believe that the same causes which are producing our own dangers and stresses are at work in the New World, and that the acute conflict between rival ideologies, which far more than Nationalism is dividing mankind into mutually abhorrent sects, is likely to break out there as soon as the growth of population has brought their standard of living to an equality with ours.

The second prognosis of the over-sanguine Doctor which we feel strongly inclined to question occurs in his chapter on the Report on Christian Doctrine. Our late President says: 'The Modern Churchmen's Union has very little left to fight about. Our occupation is gone.'

The chapter proceeds to point out that opinions which when the author was young were denounced as damnable, soul-destroying heresies are now treated by a Body presided over by the Archbishop of York as, at least, permissible varieties of opinion. No doubt at the first glance the situation looks rosy enough. But is the future, as Dr. Inge, or as most of us, envisage it, promising from the point of view of Liberal Christianity? Possibly, nay probably, we shall live to see a clash between a party which is avowedly anti-Christian and another which has no use for freedom of thought. The Modernist will be about as comfortable as a pedestrian in a motor-collision. If the Communists win, he will probably be liquidated along with his traditionalist brother. If the other side win, he will very likely have to go to a concentration camp along with infidel professors. The French Revolution was followed by a great revival of obscurantism; the latitudinarians were exterminated or driven into hiding; fortunately in those days there were country livings and colleges where unpopular thinkers could shelter from the storm. In our own opinion the euthanasia of our Union would be a grave misfortune. We had better trust in God and keep our powder dry; we may need every ounce of it before we are much older.

> 'One symptom of the temporary eclipse of liberty is the rather surprising fact that several able and high-minded men of letters, who a hundred years ago would have said with Dr. Thomas Arnold, "Believe in the Pope? I would as soon believe in Jupiter!" have made their submission to the Church of Rome.'

We understand that the late General Ludendorf did try to believe in Woden, and Mr. D. H. Lawrence wanted to worship gods compared to whom the *Jupiter Optimus Maximus* of the Romans was quite a credible and creditable divinity. And how does Dr. Inge know that the eclipse is temporary, except in the sense that all things are temporary in this world? A little further on he points to the harking back in Protestant countries to modes of thought long deemed outworn, to the revival of what is called fundamentalism in America. 'Even in England there is the curious vogue of Frank Buchman's "groups," which prove how contagious religious enthusiasm can be. In Germany we have the theology of Karl Barth, which may perhaps be described as a revival of the irrational and emotional side of Lutheranism, by one who was reared as a Calvanist.' And there are far more retrograde movements than these; there are the British Israelites, who want apparently to go back to something like pre-prophetic Judaism, and the misguided enthusiasts who think that the wisdom of all the ages was summed up by King Cheops, or whoever it was that built the Great Pyramid. Rationalism, it is generally admitted, is becoming old-fashioned, as it was during the

Dark Ages, when all enlightened men looked back with regret to the vanished world of Roman civilisation.

On the subject of race suicide, with the spectre of which certain scientists have been trying to frighten us, our Doctor prescribes a much-needed sedative. Mankind is not going to die out. 'The swarming period of the white races, which made the nineteenth century unique in history, is now at an end. We must adapt ourselves to a stationary condition in wealth and population.' There are three classes of people, he tells us, who are striving against the inevitable, old-fashioned theologians, militarists and record fanatics. The most dangerous of the three are the militarists, who want a cheap and abundant supply of cannon fodder, and who first stimulate the growth of populations in their country by all means in their power and then demand fresh territories to provide for their surplus population.

Dr. Inge is quite frankly a pacifist, in the old-fashioned sense of a man who is against war, not in the new-fangled sense of a man who wants another war to end war, or another war to make the world safer still for Democracy. He is openly opposed to a coalition against Germany.

> 'Such a coalition has been freely talked of. It would consist of ourselves, who profess to have abandoned war as an instrument of policy; of some twelve million Russian barbarians fighting under the bloodstained banner of Communism; and on the west there would be a million negroes, armed and drilled by France. These are all to be turned loose to devastate and destroy.
>
> 'I do not think the coalition would win. It would be hopelessly divided in its aims; half the home population, at any rate here, would hate the war. The probable result would be just that ascendancy of Germany which is so much feared, and among the losers all the horrors of civil war and revolution.'

Here at least the trumpet gives no uncertain note; whether it is the right note or not is, of course, a matter of opinion. In many of the articles, as is inevitable, there is a lack of finality; the journalist cannot get to the bottom of things; lack of space, not to mention other considerations, forbids it; his business is rather to suggest trains of thought, to open up vistas. And in the case of this journalist every reader must feel that what is presented to him comes from a well-filled treasury of wit and wisdom.

GAMALIEL MILNER.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE REFORMATION*

It is more possible now than it was even a few years ago to judge of the influence and the implications of the Reformation, because people are able to adopt a more detached attitude towards it. It was definitely a religious, and not what we should now call a 'liberal,' movement; though by loosening the hold of Catholicism on considerable areas of Europe, it

**The Influence and Implications of the Reformation.* By the Rev. J. P. Hodges. John Heritage. (Christian Challenge Series. 5/-. 1938.)

indirectly enabled 'liberal' ideas to germinate and grow. There was a real and important distinction between it and the Renaissance, which was humanist and therefore 'liberal.' The Renaissance thinkers 'tended to regard art and learning as ends in themselves' and 'strove to get the full value out of a life which they knew to be good.' They also entertained the characteristically 'liberal' belief that enlightenment, knowledge and reason were going to bring about the regeneration of mankind. The reformers on the other hand adopted the characteristic attitude of religion, and 'started with the fundamental conviction that life had no meaning apart from God.' Over a question of this sort Catholics and Protestants stood on the same ground, however much they might differ in other respects. Furthermore, freedom of thought formed no part of the programme of Protestants, as Calvin showed when he sent Servetus to the stake and illegally drowned Anabaptist leaders in the Lake of Geneva. As Mr. Hodges says, 'Authority merely changed its colour and toleration was almost unknown.'

A Reform movement must always take its colour from that which is reformed—even if it be an opposite colour. Catholicism was the religion of salvation by a system, and Protestantism necessarily became a religion of salvation without a system, or at least with as little system as possible. 'Protestantism rests at rock-bottom on the definition of religion as a bond beween persons and therefore an essentially personal affair.' The Soul and God is a formula which sums up the religion of Protestants; and only this formula can render the priest wholly redundant. At any rate a formula of this sort impels men to *think* about their religion:

> 'The interest in matters of religion was so keen that religious tracts formed the bulk of the literature of the day; and it is surprising how many of these tracts, showing considerable thought and knowledge both of doctrine and of the Bible, were written by men who described themselves as butcher, baker, or tinker. It is questionable whether the average layman of to-day could discuss some of the more recondite points concerning predestination and grace with an equal show of learning.'

Much has been written of the economic aspects of the Reformation. Mr. Hodges says that it is difficult to say exactly when the modern severance between religion and economics took place; and still more the modern severance between economics and ethics. A distinction ought undoubtedly to be drawn between the teachings of the Protestant leaders, and the actual practices of their followers. To make a gap in a hedge is sometimes as good as to level it. The standpoint of the leaders was 'the importance of personal responsibility and the judgment of conscience,' but nevertheless the attack on the Mediaeval machine 'probably provided plausible excuses under which men rationalized their avarice and rapacity.' After all if a man's conscience is in his own keeping he can generally stretch it to suit emergencies.

> 'Unfortunately, this appeal to conscience as the final arbiter was not a sufficient substitute for the authoritative body of doctrine with which the Mediaeval Church had controlled everyday affairs. Protestants argued that righteousness in economic dealing ought to spring from the Christian conviction of personal responsibilities. Probably nothing more than this was possible in an age which had violently reacted from Mediaeval standards; but it was too weak to be a bulwark against selfishness and its indirect result has been the separation of business dealings from direct Church influence.'

The result was the departmental view of life which still prevails widely; and the problem awaits solution—'How to make religion the effective interpreter of all life and all activity.'

Mr. Hodges' book is written from a standpoint favourable to Protestantism, but the very last thing it can be called is a partizan treatise. Indeed the chapter which will give many readers the most pleasure is that on 'The Outlook on Life in the Pre-Reformation Centuries,' with its quotations from the Paston Letters. It is indeed only too clear that the Reformed Churches can no longer go on living on the spiritual capital of the sixteenth century. The time is ripe to look around for new sources of inspiration. But Mr. Hodges has laid us under an obligation by showing just what Protestantism can and cannot do for us to-day.

J.C.H.

A MODERN THOMIST MORALIST*

As the author's preface informs us, Part I ('The Theory') with its six chapters, is an elaboration of papers read to the Aquinas Societies of London and Leicester, whilst some of the remaining eight chapters (Part II, 'Essays in Application') have also in substance appeared previously. They were well worth this more permanent presentation. No thoughtful person can read this book without profit. It widens horizons and clarifies the territories between. Thomism, Mr. Vann claims, and establishes with notable force, is not 'a dead mediaeval system' but retains for our time unimpaired its speculative and practical values. In dealing with the chaos which, partly inherited, partly self-made, whirls about us in our distressful day, 'it is well to have the ordered thought before the action.' St. Thomas gives us that ordered thought.

'The peaceful somnolence of Christianity' can be no reason for excluding theology from such a survey as this. That would, in fact, be impossible; but the discussion remains nevertheless 'on ground common to all reasonable mortal beasts,' admirably practical also, and faithful to the aim of fixing and defining 'the pattern of the Christian life on earth.'

The Thomist ethic is built on the basis of Aristotle's distinction of actual and potential, form and matter, which was itself a resolution of the an-

* *Morals Makyth Man.* By Gerald Vann, O.P. (Longmans. 1938. pp. xii + 233. 7/6 net.)

tinomies of preceding philosophers. In every constituent of creation, animate and inanimate, potentiality moves towards actuality, the unfulfilled towards fulfilment. 'The end of everything is its perfection' in all its necessary elements. It seeks this end by a natural God-implanted appetition, 'the compassing of the likeness of God by analogous imitation.' God, no longer Aristotle's remote and silent spectator, is the one Good which is the cause of all goodness, 'the one end which can be an end' for all. Upon this foundation (so imperfectly suggested here) all potentialities are fulfilled in 'wholeness, harmony, radiance'—three words in which St. Thomas defines beauty, and it would be hard to find better. Man, reasonable and autonomous, imposes upon himself this appetition as the law of his being, chosen and maintained in love; the full Christian morality knowing no sanctions but the fear of hurting what is loved—St. Augustine's '*Ama et fac quod vis,*' 'Love and do what you like.' Man's perfection comprehends body, mind or spirit, and senses ('We have lost almost entirely the great and intrinsically developed sensual awareness, or sense-awareness, and sense-knowledge, of the ancients'—a remark quoted from D. H. Lawrence); his ultimate end being 'the wholly supernatural sharing in the intimate life of God in the beatific vision.'

Meanwhile he has his working directions in this principle of '*Assimilari Deo,*' Christ's 'Be ye perfect,' the actualisation of his potentialities within the hierarchy of 'the primacy of the spiritual' by 'activity congruous with the attainment of that actualisation.' One is reminded of Keyserling's words:

> 'Anyone who aims at a form of perfection which does not correspond with his inner possibilities loses his time and misses his goal';

and Mr. Vann, one feels, would be large-minded enough to see also the force of a complementary observation from the same source, 'Only he who has been called to saintliness should strive after it.'

This very inadequate summary of a summary must inevitably fail to convey the sense of rich and satisfying adequacy which comes from reading the book itself. The central principle of a God-appointed end expounded in 'The Thomist Principle,' 'The Thomist Moral Theory' and other chapters of Part I is worked out into particular applications in Part II: 'Thomism and the Policy of Integration,' 'Politics and the Thomist Order,' 'The Economics of Personality,' 'Thomism and Peace' and elsewhere. In the rigorous economy of treatment which is observed, every page tells, every chapter is full of that authoritative, radical Christian wisdom and guidance so many people are distractedly seeking to-day.

The author would not, we conceive, willingly see himself labelled into any particular political or economic school or party. He would say, and with justice, that he is merely applying the fundamental Christian values to life in its various aspects; and if anyone put him down as a Christian

Socialist, that would be merely saying the same thing in other words. What Christian, contemplating the debasements of our commercialised civilisation, could be other than a Socialist if this is Socialism? The dignity, the divinity of human personality, the manifold and persistent outrage done to it in the conditions of life we have evolved, the general failure to rise above lip-service to the Christian ethic, these themes pervade the book. The Christian world, says Mr. Vann, failing in its duty, has abandoned our social, political and economic life 'to their own carnal law, withdrawn from the light of Christ.'

> 'The ingenuity which has created the machine age could be used to create a better, a Christian machine age. . . . A society in which a man cannot call his house his own is on the way to becoming a society in which a man cannot call his soul his own.'

All this, with much more in his abundant and forcible attack, is very much what we need to hear. These are words of life; and they surely apply not least to our own country. The same radical enquiry, directed upon the theme of Christian marriage, traces its degradation to the old enemy, selfishness, reinforced as it has been by our new economic sins. 'We are bleeding at the roots.' We must recover the old, sound, noble Christian ideal (which in Mr. Vann's hands, one feels, would escape the harsh fanaticisms of the severer orthodoxy). In the chapter on 'Peace,' true peace is defined and contrasted with our present state, and the summing-up follows:

> 'The will to peace means an all but impossible task, the promotion of justice and charity in a world given over to selfishness and greed. . . . Yet . . . precisely in so far as we are aiming at the more difficult and divine objective, the peace of Christ, we may feel ourselves sustained and encouraged by the invincible strength of Christ.'

Mr. Vann's vindication of the enduring relevancy of Thomism is a valuable and profoundly Christian contribution to truth in our time.

D. G. Davies.

WHILE I WAS MUSING*

The Sacraments of the bulk of churchgoers are two. They are the hymns and the sermon. Where the hymns are unpopular and the sermon is dull, the average churchgoer has, to use his own phrase, 'no use for the Service.' Mr. Hardwick has provided in a little volume what many churchgoers would value if they got it delivered Sunday by Sunday from the pulpit of their Parish Church. The volume consists of fifty-five sermons: terse, lucid, thoughtful, modern. The fact that fifty-five sermons are contained in a volume of less than 150 pages in good print proves how

* *While I Was Musing.* Brief Meditations on the Psalms. By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc. (Skeffington. 3/6. 1938.)

consistently Mr. Hardwick has erred on the side of mercy. Each sermon deals explicitly with one theme and adheres to it rigorously—sometimes, we feel, almost too rigorously, for there is something to be said on the other side, but Mr. Hardwick refrains from saying it. He leaves it to the intelligent and interested hearer to think it. So that as a preacher, in addition to being brief, clear, thoughtful, modern, he is also stimulating. His modernity is of the right kind: ancient truth is presented but without ancient error. New truth is also presented but in no negative and destructive fashion. It is a great accomplishment to have achieved this. These sermons are essentially helpful; Christians of any denomination, and even those who are not Christians at all, might read them with appreciation. The titles of the themes give a good idea of the preacher's range: 'Stillness,' 'Guidance,' 'Gratitude,' 'Pessimism,' 'God's Love,' 'The fool's verdict,' 'The good man,' 'A goodly heritage,' 'The supreme hope,' 'Secret faults,' 'The well of life,' 'Innocency,' 'Escape.' All the texts are taken from the Psalter—our English Prayer Book Psalter—as the titles of the sermons given may have suggested to the sapient reader.

This is not only an excellent volume for devotional reading—in other words, the kind of reading which reminds us that we are children of eternity as well as of time—but also a volume that many a lay-reader might be thankful to possess: even hard-worked parish priests, whose deeds are better than their words, might find it of service. The sermon in this collection which seems to us to get the nearest to perfection in thought and style is entitled 'Leanness.' Its text is from *Psalm* cvi; 14, 15. The Sermon opens thus:

> 'The reference is to the Israelites in their desert wanderings, and to their perversity, but we may see in the episode a parable of life. It is in the wilderness that lust does come upon us. If our life is a wilderness, devoid of humane and worthy interests, our selfish desires may get the better of us, and we may turn to self-indulgence in order to conquer our ennui. A life that is empty is infinitely boring. The whole self is not satisfied, so parts of the self, often the baser parts, seek their own satisfaction apart from the whole. We seek to enliven a dull life by indulging our appetites.
>
> 'The means of such self-indulgence can generally be found if a person is determined to have them. "He gave them their desire," says the Psalmist. We get what we want or, rather, what our narrow, partial, "carnal" self thinks it needs. But, somehow, satisfaction does not follow. For the time being appetite is appeased, but it returns, and we are uneasy until it can be appeased again. *Ecclesiastes*, as usual, hits the nail on the head: "All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea is not full. . . . All things are full of labour: man cannot utter it; the eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor the ear filled with hearing." Thus, for all our self-indulgence, we are no happier, and our inner selves no richer' (p. 117).

H.D.A.M.

THE CRISIS AND ITS CURE*

The crisis of last September has shown us, as a nation, how dangerous are the times in which we live. Hitler threatens to dominate Europe, if he does not already do so. But Nazi principles are the opposite of all that our national life has rested on for centuries. We note Hitler's advance, and ask ourselves, what is to be the future of democracy, of civilisation, of the Christian religion?

The Student Christian Movement is publishing a series of shilling booklets to help to an understanding of the crisis, and to show a way through it. The first three have just appeared and are the sort of thing to give to young people who want to know the meaning of what is happening. The first, *The Crisis and the Christian,* is by Dr. N. Micklem, Principal of Mansfield College. He shows that things are in their present mess because since 1918 we have as a nation

> 'been more concerned to maintain peace (our own) than to establish justice. Our concern first and last has been for our bank-account, our stability, our insurance policies. We have sinned through selfishness and lazy-mindedness, and we must repent. We must now stand for righteousness at any cost. But we are in such a tangle of sin that whatever we do is sinful. If we stand for righteousness we may be involved in war. We do not know with certainty that there will be peace. God's will is peace, but He has made a world in which the wages of injustice and forgetfulness is death.'

The conclusion is this:

> 'If our first aim be to save peace, we shall lose it. If we put first God's Kingdom and His righteousness, we may or we may not have war, but Europe will be saved.'

Dr. Micklem's booklet is the best statement we have seen of what the crisis means for the Christian. The second booklet, *The Crisis and Democracy,* is by Mr. J. E. Fenn, who was assistant secretary to the Oxford Conference on 'Church, Community and State,' 1937. At last year's Modern Churchmen's Conference Sir Cyril Norwood said that in the present crisis the fates of Christianity and democracy are bound up together. But Mr. Fenn does not make this clear, because he does not show the inner principle of democracy. It is this, that the humblest citizen has his life to live, as much as the greatest, and therefore should enjoy the rights of freedom and self-development. Every individual is an end in himself, and should never be treated as a means. This is one way of expressing the Christian conviction that every soul is of infinite value, because God is the loving Father of all. Every man has his own soul to save, his own way to God to find. Mr. Fenn does not sufficiently value democracy, because he does not see its essential unity with Christianity. But the practical conclusions he

* *The Crisis and the Christian,* by Nathaniel Micklem. *The Crisis and Democracy,* by J. E. Fenn. *Moral Rearmament,* by Sir William Bragg, Sir Walter Moberly and Lord Kennet. (S.C.M. 1/- each. 1938.)

draws from the crisis are sound, inspiring and thoroughly Christian. He says:

> 'In 1918 the forces of good may have won the war, but they lost the peace. Now that we have lost a war in which no shot was fired, it may be possible to win the peace.'

His concluding pages show how this may be done.

The third booklet, *Moral Rearmament*, consists of wireless talks by Sir William Bragg, Sir Walter Moberly and Lord Kennet, who all signed a notable letter to *The Times* of September 10th. These talks made an impression at the time, but they were hardly worth reprinting. They seem thin after Dr. Micklem and Mr. Fenn.

J. K. NETTTEFOLD.

CRIMINALS IN THE MAKING*

A barrister of the Inner Temple has just published a book with the above title. It is for 'Magistrates'—but it is even more interesting for the 'others.' The author, Leo Page, has made himself an expert in the administration of justice by unremitted service and hard thinking, and his mind and heart are such that these real labours have not been so much waste time. The Magistrates, Probation Officers, and Prison Visitors must have profited vastly by the addresses thus given in the last year or two. A subject which might have been unappetising has been humanised by the wealth of concrete instances adduced by Mr. Page from his own observation. There is nothing second-hand about this book. Time after time he emphasises the human side of the offender—he is man, misguided, perverted, but man. This approach to the criminal is the absolutely necessary first step whether for magistrates or others. Again, he stresses the grave defects of the benches of magistrates; and, if he is right in his condemnation (as the reviewer has good reason to think), then indeed it is high time that the qualifications for appointment to the Magistrates' Bench were re-examined and profoundly amended. No politician, local or national, should be made a J.P. because he happens to be a political light. Some knowledge of penology, of law, of prisons, of psychology, should be required. One gathers that most magistrates are ignorant of all these things. Perhaps we ought not to be surprised at this when we read towards the end of this book that 'for every juvenile court justice under 50 there are three aged 50-59, four aged 60-69, and two aged 70-79; and there are 129 over 80!' In fact Mr. Page makes us feel that the whole method of appointing justices needs revision and alteration. Justices seem to be appointed on account of their political complexions, and naturally politicians are not impartial.

Mr. Page analyses the causes of crime with the most sympathetic and incisive insight, and every social worker will agree with him that the causes of crime are:

* *For Magistrates and Others.* By Leo Page. (Faber & Faber. 1939. 7/6.)

i. Weakness of mind.
ii. Bone-laziness.
iii. Desire for sensational pleasures.
iv. Utter boredom because of idleness.
v. Betting, specially 'on the dogs.' This is probably the most harmful single cause, but is closely run by
vi. Appalling lack of parental teaching and control.

For Magistrates and Others is full of most interesting anecdotes drawn from the large store of a very observant and learned man. The English is beautiful, and this with the excellent format and printing by Messrs. Latimer Trend, of Plymouth, makes the volume pleasant to handle and read.

W.S.-L.

TWO MODERN ENGLISH PREACHERS*

The White Horseman by Dean Selwyn, and *Cambridge Sermons* by Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, possess unusual interest for collections of pulpit utterances. The two volumes present more contrast than likeness. Dr. Selwyn's were preached on various occasions to different audiences; Sir E. Hoskyns' all in the Chapel of Corpus to members of the College, in courses of careful teaching. Each volume has its appropriate introduction; the latter a personal reminiscence by Charles Smyth written with affectionate veneration, which cannot be read without sympathy; the former reflections on the Dean's experience of preaching, his own, and that of others. He points out how some functions of the Church are now exercised by others, but preaching must remain. The Church 'has a story. . . . The door of vision for men is the humanity of Christ; the preacher's calling is to open it.' He rightly says 'a short sermon takes even more arduous preparation than a long one,' and continues,

> 'I should go so far as to say that a man has never grasped the meaning of a thing himself, until he is in a position to make it intelligible to simple people.'

His sermons here are short, some broadcast, many preached on a festival, others on some public observance. In one university sermon he says:

> 'It is I think characteristic of the Bible that it nowhere assumes that men know by nature what is good. . . . The way of sacrifice to which Christ called, and still calls His disciples, requires supernatural sanctions to certify its authority; and the chief of these is the resurrection. . . . In the last resort the Christian life is not an ethic, but a vocation.'

The following sentence will sufficiently define the standpoint and outlook of the sermons:

> 'Human problems change, but human nature continues; and the world being what it is we may take it as certain that the gospel cannot be preserved except there be a Church commissioned by Christ Himself

* *The White Horseman.* E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Dean of Winchester. (S.P.C.K. 5/-. 1938.)
Cambridge Sermons. L. C. Hoskyns, Bart., Dean of Corpus. (S.P.C.K. 6/-. 1938.)

to bear witness to it, with a Ministry ordered from above to be the stewards of its mysteries, and Sacraments divinely instituted to be the seal and bond of its fellowship.'

Three or four hymns composed for particular occasions, are also printed. They doubtless served at the time but are not likely to find much further service.

Apart from one on the importance of the Parker MSS. in the College Library, which is very interesting, the sermons of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, who was Fellow and Dean of Chapel and Librarian of Corpus, fall into four courses preached in different years, on Eschatology, Sin, the Vocabulary of the Church, and the Homilies. They are direct, and free from rhetoric, though showing marked power of expression; and no one can read them attentively without feeling himself in contact with a very earnest mind, at once powerful, and equipped with learning and the fruits of sustained thought. On the Language of the Church he says:

> 'This is no new language. The Church does not create its words any more than it creates its worship. It uses words which are common to all languages of all epochs, just as it uses worship familiar to all peoples of all times. The Church does not require of us that we should master a new vocabulary, but that we should apprehend the meaning of the commonest words in our language; it demands that we should not at the critical moment turn away from the meaning of words, but that we should wrestle with them and refuse to let them go. For from these common words, from "life" and "death," from "good" and "evil," from "judgment" and "mercy," there peers out at us from our quite normal ordinary life, from the world of men and things, a secret which concerns us, and from which we cannot escape.'

This point of view enables the preacher to start with words like 'world,' 'neighbour,' 'now,' 'then,' and deal with most vital points of religion. In the Advent season, *e.g.* he says:

> 'I wonder if you are sufficiently aware how very difficult for us is this Biblical attitude to Time, or how challenging to our normal ways of thinking is the whole apprehension of Time which lies behind the Church's language, and which is summed up in those two monosyllables "now" and "then" set side by side, so that every moment in time is confronted, directly urgently confronted, by the "then" of Eternity itself.'

The Homilies are recalled to show the mind of the Church, and that it 'once again may recover its voice, and something also of its ancient confidence.'

These sermons are cogent:

> 'Those who composed the English Homilies . . . wrote for the realm of England, and for this reason they wrote not a compendium of speculative theology . . . but a series of homilies to be read, to be preached, to the people of this country. They had not forgotten that the Lord spoke to the crowds, that the God whom they worshipped is the Creator of the universe visible and invisible, and that Jesus is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.'

In a course on Eschatology, the eschatological outlook in Jesus' mind and message is emphasised. Then it is stressed in the rest of the New Testament with the transformation it underwent in the latest writings, with the result that

> 'Our Lord's eschatological language, as indeed all His teaching and actions, was mainly symbolical. To speak humanly, He felt Himself standing on the brink of a new spiritual order to come into being as a direct result of His life and death. . . . So he used the traditional language of Jewish expectation of the End, since it provided Him with a vehicle to express the significance of His life and death. . . . The emerging in history of the Christian Ecclesia throws a flood of light on our Lord's teaching. . . . And the Church of God, which is faith and joy and love as an organism is the fulfilment of our Lord's language concerning the coming of the End. . . . The true function of the Church is to bring men into the presence of God, and to believe confidently that a new love and a new charity will thereby be formed in them. . . . Our Christian language and symbolism is far more fundamentally true than most people perceive.'

The greatest course, the most sombre, but the most inspiring, is that on Sin. 'The secularising of the Christian religion lurks like a cancer behind the history of the Church, and from time to time it breaks forth violently causing great pains and prostration. Then it is that the world invades the Church, attacking it powerfully from without and subtly from within. From one of these virulent attacks we are now suffering.' This sin is not entirely personal, much less wholly conscious. The sense of it in the whole world is overwhelming in the Old Testament and in the New Testament and our Lord's mind alike, and only the overmastering power and love of God can set us free. This is the significance of the 'miracles';

> 'The question we are meant to ask is not, Did they happen? (that is comparatively irrelevant) but, What did they mean to our Lord? and What therefore do they mean to us?'

So too of the crucifixion,

> 'to us Christians it is fundamentally the symbol of human inadequacy, the revelation of the horror of sin, more horrible because none of those who crucified Him knew what they were doing. . . . From the crucifixion of the Lord there emerged in the world the new Ecclesia of God.'

Striking exposition of the Book of Job affirms that if we understand it we are on the threshold of the New Testament. And the history and meaning of 'the Church' are set forth arrestingly, leading to the conclusion that

> 'Christianity is not anthropology; it is the revelation of the power and of the mercy of God. As the power of God is revealed in the heavens, so His mercy is displayed in the Church. And the Gospel of the Church is the remission of sins.'

The responsibility for facing this fact of Divine Love forgiving where sin is universal and otherwise hopeless, and for witnessing to it always, is impressively, and in urgent humility, driven home.

E. P. Boys-Smith.

WORSHIP IN CHURCH*

The inspirer of this series of pamphlets justifies it on the grounds that Church Worship is vital to the Church's evangelism and that men and women demand a reality in worship which explanations of its component parts can give. The pamphlets are to be twelve in number, but so far only the first six are published. They treat, or will treat, of: 1, Common Prayer; 2, Morning and Evening Prayer; 3, The Psalms; 4, The Creed; 5, The Hymns; 6, Praying Together; 7, The Lessons; 8, The Sermon; 9, The Church's Year; 10 and 11, Preparation for receiving Baptism and the Holy Communion; and 12, The Holy Communion Service itself. They run to about five pages of small octavo, are attractively produced, and — are of unequal value.

The helpful one on the Psalter justifies the latter's use on the grounds

> 'that it contains the most perfect expression of man's varying needs and moods as he seeks God or rejoices in Him.'

And again:

> 'It is because in the Psalms humanity hears its own voice that they remain so apposite for mankind's worship of God. . . . But not all the Psalms are suitable for public worship.'

We have to add that even some of those which the writer of this pamphlet selects as 'gems' (which they are) contain blemishes which the public worshipper who has become sensitive to the words he has to use will continue to feel unhappy about. But this pamphlet (which also explains the Gloria and discusses the pointing of the Psalms) is more satisfactory than the general justification of the Psalter given in what ought to be the most useful pamphlet of them all, *viz.* No. 2—the description of the parts of Morning and Evening Prayer. There we read the explanation that 'the Hymn Book of the old Jewish Church . . . looked forward to the coming of Christ' — a way of dealing with the relation between the Old and New Testament which is open to misunderstanding. Also, this pamphlet justifies the use of our own hymns and anthems partly on the ground that 'this break provides a change of posture'! Is not one of the real criticisms of Morning and Evening Prayer that these Offices provide in themselves a distracting number of changes of posture and help to justify the charge that members of the Church of England are never taught to concentrate in prayer?

The pamphlet on the Creed is disappointing to Modernists. It makes no distinction between a victorious Christian faith and the forms of faith in which it is expressed. Such phrases as 'born of the Virgin Mary,' 'He decended into Hell,' and 'the Resurrection of the Body' are defended on the ground that

> 'it is vital to real worship that the wonder and the love of God shall

*A series of Pamphlets published by W. Heffer & Sons Ltd., Cambridge. 1*d.* each.

not be rendered in a series of platitudes but in words which hint at a mystery beyond our grasp . . .'

Surely one trouble is that these very definite phrases eliminate mystery and substitute bewilderment for wonder. Moreover there is no explanation in this pamphlet of the way in which some of the Credal phrases are symbolic of profound religious experiences, although we are glad to read the general statement that

'the Creed is indeed the crystallization of Christian experience in a form convenient to act as a continual reminder.'

We like best the pamphlets on 'Common Prayer' and 'Praying Together.' The latter explains intercession, extempore prayer and the structure of the collect. The former is summed up by a concluding quotation from the Archbishop of York:

'If when you come out from your worship there is no more love in your heart than when you began, then either your worship was humbug or else it was not directed to the true God.'

These pamphlets have received a considerable welcome already, which indicates that they are helping to fulfil their object; though perhaps the souls that by their guidance have learnt to breathe through our forms of worship will presently cry out for more and still purer air. That these present forms of worship should need such explanations in order to impart reality to them is a sure sign that they have lost the power to speak directly to the soul and that they need revision. R. D. Richardson.

SHORT NOTICES

Old Testament Prophecy. By the Rev. W. H. Oldaker, M.A. (Martin Hopkinson, Ltd. Part I, 2/6; Part II, 2/-. 1938.)

This book is primarily intended to be a School Certificate Course, and its author aims at showing that the religion of the Old Testament is a progressive revelation of God. In the Introduction there is a very valuable section dealing with Inspiration and Revelation, a few brief quotations from which will show the author's standpoint:

'If God wanted to use . . . human personalities to reveal his message to mankind, He was not going to reduce them to automatas at the start by taking away all possibility of error.'

Speaking of the Apocrypha, he says

'We have no right to say that the stories of magnificent heroism in the Maccabees are less valuable than some of the more savage parts of the Book of Judges.'

Or again

'Nor ought we to look in the Bible only for the inspiration of God.'

A large part of the book consists of those portions of the Old Testament set in the School Certificate examinations, *i.e.* portions of 1 and 2 Kings, Hosea, Amos, and portions of Isaiah I—XXXV, with brief notes. There are useful chapters on such subjects as The Earlier Prophets and the relations of Judah and Israel with Syria and Assyria. The book should prove

useful not only to those studying for an examination, but to any who desire to understand the modern approach to the Old Testament and the real value of the work of the prophets. E.R.B.

The Acts of the Apostles (Revised Version). Edited with Introduction and Notes for the use of Schools. By the Rev. H. K. Luce, M.A., B.D. (A. & C. Black, Ltd. 2/6. 1938.)

This is an excellent little book. Both the Introduction and Notes are brief but afford the help required for an intelligent study of Acts. In the Introduction Mr. Luce gives the arguments on both sides on points about which scholars are not unanimous. For instance, he gives the arguments for and against the view that the book as a whole is by Luke, the companion of Paul, and concludes that if it be not, the 'we' passages are probably extracts from Luke's diary. Again, when discussing the date of its composition, he allows for the possibility that the mistake about the rebellions of Theudas and Judas may have been due to a misreading of the *Antiquities* of Josephus. Two interesting sections are devoted to (1) The sources of the book and the quality of its history, (2) The early Christian Church. While most of the Notes are quite short there are a few longer ones, dealing with matters of special difficulty or importance, *e.g.* those on speaking with tongues, on the Conversion of Paul, on the decree of the Council of Jerusalem, and on the reason for which the book ends so abruptly. The last of these Notes ends with the words 'we must confess that we do not know,' a conclusion with which all who have studied the subject carefully must agree. The book is illustrated with a number of sketch maps in which only places mentioned in the portion of the text they illustrate are marked, a feature which will add to their usefulness.

E.R.B.

Arise Shine. By Hugh A. Studdert Kennedy. (Putnam. 5/-. 1939.)

Arise Shine, by the brother of Woodbine Willie, will need no recommendation to those who are already familiar with this author's work. It contains matter which has already appeared in periodicals abroad, as well as new material. Those who are not familiar with the author may be recommended to try this volume of meditative essayettes — devotional writings, the dust cover calls them, but there is nothing of the pietist about these essays and fables, so I prefer to avoid the word devotional in writing of them.

The parson hard put to it to find material for his next sermon could not do better than have this volume by him for it contains kernels round which he could wrap many a husk of his own. There is ripe wisdom, optimism and humour and a flavour which I can best describe as rustic, *i.e.* the commonsense of the countryman.

Modernists will read with pleasure Mr. Kennedy's interpretation of the Creed, also the appreciations of Woodbine Willie. Running through the book is the theme that God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. Facts are facts all the world over, it is the lies and illusions about them that cause all the trouble in the world. Of these illusions death is the greatest.

> 'Death is the gateway to nothing but the recognition of its own illusionary nature. It is not a friend but an enemy, for progress comes from an understanding of life and not from a belief in death. The great demand therefore is to understand life . . . and the abandonment of the crippling belief that it is impossible to see beyond its (death's) illusionary barriers.'

A brave book and full of that same understanding of life. J.D.P.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

CIVILIZATION AND THE CHRISTIAN METAPHYSIC.

SIR,

In the article, 'Civilization and its Unseen Foundations,' urging the world community of the Church based on the rock of God's wisdom and goodness as the only sure foundation, the Rev. J. K. Nettlefold has indicated what the Church might well maintain more aggressively. The Christian doctrine of the dynamic of true progress is based on a definite metaphysic of the cosmos in which we live. It maintains that obedience to the revealed will of God is the only way of attaining a complete and stable civilization on the metaphysical grounds that the universe is so constituted that this is inexorably true, God's will for us being related to this end as cause to effect through a continuum which is itself the creation of God's will.

In asserting that the revealed will of God gives us an authoritative proclamation of the nature of this continuum and the causal relations within it we need not claim to state thereby the whole significance of this revelation, but only what this significance includes. When Jesus said 'Love your enemies' did he not do more than command a certain conduct, namely, indicate the causally creative connection of this conduct with the civilization which God wills to be on earth, with the correlative truth that no policy which omits it can ultimately succeed? When He said 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' did He not implicitly tell us that the society at which Christian conduct aims is of such a kind that it can only be created and can only subsist by this practice, and that in the very nature of things no civilization built otherwise can be final or permanent?

The sceptic who doubts the reality of an ultimate best may deny any such metaphysic. But if we believe in this we require a metaphysic which fulfills at least three conditions. First, reality must be such that the true civilization can both become and be permanent, there being no incongruity of itself with the foundation of all being. Second, since it is to be realized through the instrumentality of man, there must be a causal connection, which reality makes sufficient, between human conduct and this civilization. Third, since the human conduct involved in its creation must be determined through our own thought and will, this causal connection must be known authoritatively, proclaiming itself.

In his own way the humanist may believe in the first two conditions along with the Christian, though without a metaphysical justification for either. The third he usually does not believe, and cannot truly believe. Here he differs from the Christian to his detriment.

We may distinguish two ways in which this causal connection may be conceived to be discoverable. First, the conduct required as means may be deduced from the progressive perception of the end. This is the only way open to the humanist, who must experiment with means chosen by his idea of the end. The limitations of this procedure are obvious. The end can be seen neither with completeness nor certainty. The mediacy of human knowledge renders its perception at every step precarious. We are thus entirely dependent on a gradual appearance of the end, which appearance becomes falsified through the interpretative processes involved in its very perception. Hence Irving Babbitt, 'such reality as man can perceive is inextricably bound up with illusion.' There is no guarantee of the con-

nection of any specific conduct with the true end. Hence Mr. Katz says that man must go on experimenting, following paths leading he knows not where. Hence also those means proposed by Aldous Huxley which come directly from his system, and which are related not as the parts to the whole of a civilization already known, but as true means to an ultimate civilization, are negative in character. 'Non-attachment' is an example. So long as we have to depend on the appearance of an end beyond our vision we can proceed only by negative differentiation.

How does the Christian stand? He is not dependent on his vision of the actual end. He begins rather with the means. He claims that, not the end, but the foundation of the end is revealed to him. This foundation is God, Who reveals Himself as Will, declaring the required conduct. And because this Will which directs his conduct is also the foundation of the true civilization of man and of the continuum through which it is to be realized, the necessary causal connection is assured. It is because of the causal connection that conduct commanded is commanded. It is only he who takes his stand on such a metaphysic who dare go out not knowing whither he goeth.

Here the obvious challenge must be faced. How do we know God's Will adequately, if we cannot know the end adequately? It may be true that we must receive all revelation in terms of human thought and experience. But in so far as God's Will relates to our human conduct we have a first-hand knowledge of the elements required for an appreciation of this Will, since we know our own conduct. Further, though our knowledge be mediate, limited, and in terms of our own thought-forms, cannot God include within His act in revelation the guidance as to how we are to combine our thought-forms? The elements being ours and their combination into principles of conduct being God's we thereby know God's Will. Revelation may never be finally grasped where it concerns the end of conduct, but what is to prevent its adequate reception where it concerns the conduct itself? Man's fallen state may render both God Himself and the true civilization which He wills to be on earth inaccessible to our understanding, but why should it render His guiding Will inaccessible? Is it not the core of the Christian Faith that God speaks savingly to men in their sin? Why should this circumstance do more than moralise the coming of this Will and occasion its adaptation to our need? God's Will may be in itself an indicative, but it adapts itself to our sinful state and comes as a moral imperative. Its efficacy in pointing out our path towards the only true civilization is not thereby impaired, but rather is thereby accomplished. Moreover, since the results of the coming of God's Will are accomplished within the sphere of human experience, they can be permanently possessed by the world. The prophet and ourselves are at least alike in being men, and his words which record the guidance given to his human thought are there to guide us in forming out of our human thought the same principles of conduct as God indicated to him.

Thus despite the Barthian caveats we seem to be justified in holding that the revelation of God's Will overcomes the limitations of our state and understanding sufficiently to render His leadership towards a final world civilization a real leadership. The sceptic may justifiably demand that the reality of this leadership be experimentally verified. So it must be, but how? Negative verification of its reality is tragically and amply apparent to observation, every war revealing how the denial of God's Will works death and destruction. Positive verification by observation of the effects of this leadership is limited by the extent of our trust in it. We must verify not the effect but the cause, not the final end directly but its Foundation

directly. By prayerful union of ourselves with God Who reveals Himself as Will we find that He is real, and by trustful obedience to the Will of Him Who is the Foundation of all things good we shall know that all things work together for good to them that love God.

A. M. FAIRWEATHER.

South Mause,
Grantown-on-Spey.

MODERNISTS AND THE CREEDS.

SIR,

The statement of the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union regarding the Creeds will, I feel sure, be regarded by very many members, with much approval and relief, and particularly by those of us who have urged this step for years past.

It is a statement that cannot be ignored by those in authority, who *must* know that many thousands of members of the Church of England cannot conscientiously repeat them, and, if still churchgoers, are dumb when the Creeds are recited.

But it does not end here. Many doubtless feel that it is dishonest for the clergy to repeat the Creeds—but with reservations in their minds. Surely it should not be impossible to introduce a simpler form omitting clauses which are mentioned as 'impossible.' (Clause (2) of the statement.) Those who have 'loved their Church long since' but who have 'lost it awhile' because it has not re-interpreted the Creeds, in spite of the fact that scientific research, and deep and thoughtful criticism, have made this re-interpretation necessary. So, as you say in *Signs of the Times*, 'Yet more remains to be done, and to be done as quickly as possible' if those who now remain outside the fold are to return to it.

J. WHEELER WILLIAMS.

THE PROBLEM OF THE CUP AT HOLY COMMUNION.

SIR,

I am a long-time subscriber and appreciative reader of *The Modern Churchman*, and for the first time I find that I must challenge one of your editorials. I refer to your February number and the editorial on *The Problem of the Cup at Holy Communion*. You are right to say that a feeling of delicacy repels many from the Communion where the common Cup is used. But when you declare fear of contagion ('danger to health' is your phrase) has very largely broken down at the bar of medical criticism, I would ask who has polled the medical bar? For I would confidently venture that the same medical bar that said the common drinking cup is a menace to health and finally secured its prohibition would also say that the same is true of the common Communion Cup; they would declare that no miracle of immunity is performed in particular cases or in groups of communicants.

But the weakest point in the above editorial is in 'a solution of the difficulty (which) has occurred to us.' That solution you give in the following words:

'The minister, representing the Fellowship of the Faithful, presents the Chalice to the communicant: the communicant devoutly receives the same, but decides for himself, as he raises it towards his lips, whether or not he shall actually drink from it. Such a solution would seem to be entirely in accordance with the spirit of the English Church. In presenting the Cup to the instructed communicant, that Church, through its minister, does what it ought to do, and the communicant is left free to decide for himself whether he will drink from it or not.'

Pardon me for saying that to my mind such a procedure would be a legalistic subterfuge so bald as to repel more people from the Communion than all fear of contagion and feelings of delicacy combined. It would seem to say that, faced with something one would avoid, he has only to juggle the sacred chalice to get by. To such ends is one driven when one endeavours to justify the unjustifiable. I would suspect that such a manoeuvre would cause many straight-thinking people to lose faith in the commonsense and forthrightness of the Church.

May I ask what has one cup or many cups or the method whereby the elements are communicated to do with our dear Lord's purpose when he said, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' Do what? Was he thinking or speaking of cup or cups and the manual acts? We know very well he was not, and that the instruments and manipulations were indifferent. If that is true, why are we bickering about (I use your words) 'the triumph of the Reformation,' 'loyalty to the terms,' 'Church authorities,' 'accordance with the spirit of the English Church,' etc. Is not that just the sort of thing that Jesus condemned when he spoke of defeating the purpose of God by the 'traditions of men?' (Matthew xv, 2, 3 and Mark vii, 1-8).

It seems abundantly clear that what Jesus wished was Communion with Him, and logically He would not have communicants disturbed by either fear or disgust because of the physical accidents. The argument (to use your phrase again) seems to us irrefutable.

May I close with these comments: If the loving Cup has become disused at secular feasts because it is indelicate and dangerous, we have no right to be indelicate and dangerous at the Communion; nor to repel people by legal insistence. To do so is an indignity to God, for surely God's table should be shielded from everything that gives offence more than our ordinary tables. Again the administration of the Holy Communion by intinction is no longer an experiment. It is a practice in many American churches, parishes, and cathedrals, and in at least one diocese, and has become increasingly so for a quarter of a century. If it is a breach of the law, it is no more so than some of the acts of our dear Lord when the law stood in the way of common sense and human need. Finally, where the method of intinction is practised, we observe that more people come to the Communion than formerly; that they are as devout as those who receive from the Common Cup and their life and practice is unimpaired. Those things being so, if there are laws which seem to forbid intinction, the quicker they are annulled the better. When that is done, your columns will be relieved from further discussion of this subject and more people will receive Communion and will come undisturbed by material and manual matters. Surely it is our bounden duty to remove all obstacles and 'in countless numbers let them come.'

The Church of the Ascension,
Fifth Avenue at Tenth Street,
New York.

CLIFTON MACON, D.D.

THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

Annual Meetings, Wednesday, May 17th, 1939. 11.30 a.m., Holy Communion with Sermon at St. Margaret's Church, Westminster (by kind permission of the Rector, Canon V. F. Storr). Preacher, the Rt. Rev. H. Hensley Henson, D.D. 2.30 p.m., Annual General Meeting at the Assembly Room, Methodist Central Hall, Westminster, S.W.1 (entrance in Matthew Parker Street). After business an Address will be given by Charles G. Ammon, J.P., M.P. Subject, 'Christianity and Social Problems.' Discussion.

T. J. WOOD,
Organising Secretary.